

Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals

of the
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

VOLUME 20

JANUARY, 1936

NUMBER 59

ISSUES OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

REPORT
of the

Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education

Department of Secondary-
School Principals
of the
National Education Association

FRANCIS L. BACON
THOMAS H. BRIGGS, *Chairman*
WILL FRENCH
ARTHUR GOULD
SIDNEY B. HALL
FRED J. KELLY
JOHN A. LESTER
RUDOLPH D. LINDQUIST
TRUMAN G. REED
HEBER H. RYAN
FRANCIS T. SPAULDING
CURTIS H. THRELKELD

Issued Five Times a Year

\$2.00 a Year

\$1.00

January, March, April, May, and December

Published by

Department of Secondary-School Principals of the
National Education Association
5835 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago

Entered as second-class matter November 15, 1934, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 12, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage, provided for in Section 1103, Act of February 28, 1925, authorized November 15, 1934.

\$1.

Pat 28
3193
5759

Bulletin of the Department of
Secondary-School Principals
OF THE
NATIONAL (EDUCATION) ASSOCIATION of secondary
" school principals.
Issued Five Times a Year
January, March, April, May, and December
JANUARY, 1936
SERIAL NUMBER 59

**ISSUES OF
SECONDARY EDUCATION
REPORT**
of the
COMMITTEE ON THE ORIENTATION OF SECONDARY
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY-
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS NATIONAL EDUCA-
TION ASSOCIATION

70

FRANCIS L. BACON
THOMAS H. BRIGGS, *Chairman*
WILL FRENCH
ARTHUR GOULD
SIDNEY B. HALL
FRED J. KELLY
JOHN A. LESTER
RUDOLPH D. LINDQUIST
TRUMAN G. REED
HEBER H. RYAN
FRANCIS T. SPAULDING
CURTIS H. THRELKELD

1936

Published by
**THE DEPARTMENT OF
SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
OF THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION**

H. V. CHURCH, Executive Secretary,
5835 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago

\$1.00

\$2.00 a Year

Secretaries of State Organizations

Affiliated with the

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

- W. L. SPENCER
Department of Education,
Montgomery, Alabama.
- V. E. SAMMONS,
Senior High School,
Hot Springs National Park,
Arkansas.
- HARRY G. HANSELL,
2694 Twenty-third Avenue,
San Francisco, California.
- J. FRED ESSIG,
Junior-Senior High School,
Longmont, Colorado.
- T. E. CURRAN,
Sheridan Junior High
School,
New Haven, Connecticut.
- CHARLES D. LUTZ,
Horace Mann School,
6th and Garfield,
Gary, Ind.
- JAMES E. BLUE,
Senior High School,
Rockford, Illinois.
- S. E. THOMPSON,
Amos Hiatt Junior High
School,
Des Moines, Iowa.
- G. C. DOTZOUR,
Wichita High School, North
Wichita, Kansas.
- W. R. CHAMPION,
Public Schools,
Lancaster, Kentucky.
- HARRISON C. LYSETH,
State House,
Augusta, Maine.
- WILLIAM D. SPRAGUE,
High School,
Melrose, Massachusetts.
- EDGAR G. JOHNSTON,
University High School
Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- CHARLES W. BOARDMAN,
University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minnesota
- J. D. HULL,
Senior High School,
Springfield, Missouri.
- W. L. NEWTON,
Rome Free Academy,
Rome, New York.
- G. HARVEY NICHOLLS,
High School,
Bound Brook, New Jersey.
- DEAN M. HICKSON,
Lancaster, Ohio.
- CARL C. CRESS,
Harding Junior High
School, Oklahoma City,
Oklahoma.
- S. F. BALL,
Franklin School,
Portland, Oregon.
- WILLIAM H. BRISTOW,
Pennsylvania Department
of Public Instruction,
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
- GEORGE M. FRANDSEN,
Eastern High and Training
School, Madison, South
Dakota.
- ELIZABETH FITZGERALD,
West High School,
Salt Lake City, Utah.
- ROBERT N. MILLET,
High School,
Springfield, Vermont.
- G. N. PORTER,
Garfield High School,
Seattle, Washington.
- VIRGIL L. FLINN,
High School,
Charleston, West Virginia.
- J. H. MCNEEL,
High School,
Beloit, Wisconsin.
- CHESTER W. HOLMES,
Langley Junior High
School, Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

BULLETIN NUMBER 59

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

JANUARY, 1936

Officers of Department of Secondary-School Principals....	3
---	---

ISSUES OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

Introduction.....	7
Issues of Secondary Education.....	20

ISSUE I.

Shall secondary education be provided at public expense for all normal individuals or for only a limited number?.....	31
---	----

ISSUE II.

Shall secondary education seek to retain all pupils in school as long as they wish to remain, or shall it transfer them to other agencies under educational supervision when, in the judgment of the school authorities, these agencies promise to serve better the pupils' immediate and probable future needs?.....	79
---	----

ISSUE III.

Shall secondary education be concerned only with the welfare and progress of the individual, or with these only as they promise to contribute to the welfare and progress of society?.....	129
--	-----

ISSUE IV.

Shall secondary education provide a common curriculum for all, or differentiated offerings?.....	157
--	-----

ISSUE V.

Shall secondary education include vocational training, or shall it be restricted to general education?.....	185
---	-----

Secretaries of State Organizations

Affiliated with the

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

- W. L. SPENCER
Department of Education,
Montgomery, Alabama.
- V. E. SAMMONS,
Senior High School,
Hot Springs National Park,
Arkansas.
- HARRY G. HANSELL,
2694 Twenty-third Avenue,
San Francisco, California.
- J. FRED ESSIG,
Junior-Senior High School,
Longmont, Colorado.
- T. E. CURRAN,
Sheridan Junior High
School,
New Haven, Connecticut.
- CHARLES D. LUTZ.,
Horace Mann School,
6th and Garfield,
Gary, Ind.
- JAMES E. BLUE,
Senior High School,
Rockford, Illinois.
- S. E. THOMPSON,
Amos Hiatt Junior High
School,
Des Moines, Iowa.
- G. C. DOTZOUR,
Wichita High School, North
Wichita, Kansas.
- W. R. CHAMPION,
Public Schools,
Lancaster, Kentucky.
- HARRISON C. LYSETH,
State House,
Augusta, Maine.
- WILLIAM D. SPRAGUE,
High School,
Melrose, Massachusetts.
- EDGAR G. JOHNSTON,
University High School
Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- CHARLES W. BOARDMAN,
University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minnesota
- J. D. HULL,
Senior High School,
Springfield, Missouri.
- W. L. NEWTON,
Rome Free Academy,
Rome, New York.
- G. HARVEY NICHOLLS,
High School,
Bound Brook, New Jersey.
- DEAN M. HICKSON,
Lancaster, Ohio.
- CARL C. CRESS,
Harding Junior High
School, Oklahoma City,
Oklahoma.
- S. F. BALL,
Franklin School,
Portland, Oregon.
- WILLIAM H. BRISTOW,
Pennsylvania Department
of Public Instruction,
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
- GEORGE M. FRANDSEN,
Eastern High and Training
School, Madison, South
Dakota.
- ELIZABETH FITZGERALD,
West High School,
Salt Lake City, Utah.
- ROBERT N. MILLET,
High School,
Springfield, Vermont.
- G. N. PORTER,
Garfield High School,
Seattle, Washington.
- VIRGIL L. FLINN,
High School,
Charleston, West Virginia.
- J. H. MCNEEL,
High School,
Beloit, Wisconsin.
- CHESTER W. HOLMES,
Langley Junior High
School, Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

BULLETIN NUMBER 59

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION JANUARY, 1936

Officers of Department of Secondary-School Principals....	3
---	---

ISSUES OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

Introduction.....	7
Issues of Secondary Education.....	20

ISSUE I.

Shall secondary education be provided at public expense for all normal individuals or for only a limited number?.....	31
---	----

ISSUE II.

Shall secondary education seek to retain all pupils in school as long as they wish to remain, or shall it transfer them to other agencies under educational supervision when, in the judgment of the school authorities, these agencies promise to serve better the pupils' immediate and probable future needs?.....	79
---	----

ISSUE III.

Shall secondary education be concerned only with the welfare and progress of the individual, or with these only as they promise to contribute to the welfare and progress of society?.....	129
--	-----

ISSUE IV.

Shall secondary education provide a common curriculum for all, or differentiated offerings?.....	157
--	-----

ISSUE V.

Shall secondary education include vocational training, or shall it be restricted to general education?.....	185
---	-----

ISSUE VI.

Shall secondary education be primarily directed toward preparation for advanced studies, or shall it be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses, regardless of a student's future academic career?..... 212

ISSUE VII.

Shall secondary education accept conventional school subjects as fundamental categories under which school experiences shall be classified and presented to students, or shall it arrange and present experiences in fundamental categories directly related to the performance of such functions of secondary schools in a democracy as increasing the ability and the desire better to meet socio-civic, economic, health, leisure-time, vocational, and pre-professional problems and situations?..... 257

ISSUE VIII.

Shall secondary education present merely organized knowledge, or shall it also assume responsibility for attitudes and ideals?..... 292

ISSUE IX.

Shall secondary education seek merely the adjustment of students to prevailing social ideals, or shall it seek the reconstruction of society?..... 311

ISSUE X.

Granting that education is a "gradual, continuous, unitary process," shall secondary education be presented merely as a phase of such a process, or shall it be organized as a distinct but closely articulating part of the entire educational program, with peculiarly emphasized functions of its own?..... 350

Program, Department of Secondary-School Principals,
St. Louis, Missouri..... 365

Postal Insurance Notice..... 372

INTRODUCTION

History of the Committee. At the Washington meeting of the Department in 1932 following an address by Professor Briggs on "A Program for Secondary Education," Professor Jesse B. Davis made a motion that a commission be appointed to study and restate the principles and objectives of secondary education. Subsequently President W. W. Haggard named a small committee, consisting of Milo H. Stuart, Curtis H. Threlkeld, and Thomas H. Briggs, to plan what could be done. This committee, meeting with President Haggard and Secretary Church, agreed that a Commission should be appointed and that funds should be secured or appropriated that would make possible effective work. In response to an official request the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching made a grant of \$9000 and at Minneapolis the Department appropriated \$6000 to finance the work for three years. President Haggard appointed the following committee:

THOMAS H. BRIGGS, *Chairman*

Professor of Education

Teachers College, Columbia University

New York, N. Y.

B. P. FOWLER

Headmaster, Tower Hill School

Wilmington, Delaware

ARTHUR GOULD

Deputy Superintendent of Schools

Los Angeles, California

SIDNEY B. HALL

State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Richmond, Virginia

FRED J. KELLY

Chief, Division of Colleges and Professional Schools

Office of Education

Washington, D. C.

RUDOLPH D. LINDQUIST

Director of the University School

The Ohio State University

Columbus, Ohio

FRANCIS T. SPAULDING
Professor of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

MILO H. STUART
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Indianapolis, Indiana

CURTIS H. THRELKELD
Principal of Columbia High School
South Orange, N. J.

This original committee has subsequently been enlarged by the addition of Truman G. Reed, Arthur K. Loomis, and Will French; John A. Lester and Heber H. Ryan replaced Messrs. Fowler and Loomis, who resigned, and Francis L. Bacon took the place of Mr. Stuart, whose untimely demise we still mourn.

This Committee is widely representative geographically and professionally. Three are now principals of public high schools and several others have held that position; three are principals of high schools maintained by universities; two are heads of private schools; two are professors of secondary education; two are assistant superintendents in charge now or previously of high schools; one is a superintendent of schools, formerly a high-school principal and later active in curriculum revision; one is a state superintendent of public instruction; one is a specialist in higher education in the Federal Office of Education; and three are active in the Progressive Education Association movement.

At this point I should like to pay tribute to the competence of the members of the Committee, to their knowledge of conditions, their thoughtfulness about fundamental matters, their open-mindedness, their coöperativeness, their industry, and their wisdom. The only objection that I can cite is that their very competence has caused too many demands on them for other duties.

Technique of the Committee. Being aware of the handicaps under which committees labor when they are forced to meet hurriedly at conventions which make many other demands, this Committee has used the funds at its disposal chiefly to make possible six meetings, each of approximately a week in length, at some remote but comfortable place where

there was nothing else to do but work. The faithfulness of the members at these meetings has been notable.

After discussion of the general problem, it was agreed to consider the issues and the functions of secondary education. An issue is defined as a conflict of theory with theory, of theory with practice, or of practice with practice. At first it was hoped that some more direct contribution could be made to the curriculum, but the former agenda proved more than sufficient to consume all of the available time and energies. Following full discussion each member assumed responsibility for writing a report, first on one of the issues and later on one of the functions. These tentative reports were duplicated, distributed for consideration, and further discussed at later meetings. In some cases the reports as a result of these discussions, supplemented by consequent correspondence, have been written as many as five or six times. No report can truthfully be said to be the product of any single individual.

Although the Committee have been in remarkable agreement on most matters, especially those of major importance, individual members should not be held responsible for every detail of expression. Inevitably there have had to be some compromises that do not satisfy everyone. But none of them have been considered to be of sufficient importance to warrant a minority report. Disagreement was marked on Issue IX. and that report especially should be read with the understanding that, although there is general approval of what is stated it omits points that some members waived in order to secure unanimous agreement. To this report each member had the privilege to enter a brief dissent on any part if he so desired.

In the autumn of 1934 1500 copies of a tentative report on the issues were printed, but not published, and distributed to more than seventy groups of secondary-school administrators and to a few selected individuals for criticism. The returns, which evidenced great interest in the report and appreciation of its importance, were all carefully considered, and proved so highly helpful in the rewriting that the novelty of the project of issuing a tentative report was wholly justified. The critics made few suggestions as to implementation and as to how obstacles could be overcome, but they did contribute many sound suggestions, and, moreover, they indicated the need of further clarifying passages which the Committee had thought were already clear. In some instances, however, the Committee has not known how to convey its meaning better than a careful reading of its statements would reveal.

Each member of the Committee has individually consulted with numerous people who were thought to be unusually competent regarding some phases of the issues under discussion, and the report gives evidence of the wisdom of their contributions. In addition, at the last meeting of the Committee Professor Orville G. Brim, of Ohio State University, and Professor George C. Kyte, of the University of California, were present by invitation to represent elementary education. Their help in the discussion not only of the functions but also of the issues is gratefully acknowledged.

When parts of a major report are written by several individuals, there is an inevitable variation in style. This was especially noticeable in the tentative edition. To gain, so far as was possible, a uniformity in presentation, Mr. Paul B. Diederich was employed as editor. He should not be held responsible for the ideas of the Committee, but he is hereby given credit for not only a greatly improved form but also for many other contributions which only the members of the Committee can appreciate. Mr. Francis A. Young has edited the final report for mechanical features and has seen it through the press.

The Committee has spent only a little more than the subsidy from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, leaving almost untouched the appropriation from the funds of this Department. At this point it is pertinent to record that by careful estimate the preparation of the report has cost the members of the Committee and their employers more than \$30,000.

The Work of the Committee. In the first annual report of this Committee the need for such work as it proposed to undertake was discussed. It was there pointed out that since 1918, when the report of the latest national committee, that of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, was published, there had been many changes, not merely in the work of secondary schools but in civilization as well. It was recognized that the problems of secondary education are not isolated and independent, but are inextricably bound up with those of elementary, vocational, "special," adult, and higher cultural education. For these and other reasons it was felt that the time was ripe for a consideration of some of the fundamental problems that underlie not only secondary education but also all of the provisions that society should make for the care of its youth.

Inasmuch as our civilization has never attempted frankly to face and to solve these fundamental problems (As a matter of fact, society has scarcely been aware of them) the challenge was stupendous. At first the Committee hoped to do even more than has been possible in the limitations of time and resources at its disposal. It frankly recognizes the need for a comprehensive program for the care and education of youth, including far more definite and justifiable details of a curriculum than we have, but the construction of this program will require a great deal of money, a large staff of full time expert workers, and some years of devoted labor. It cannot be soundly built until the foundations are laid. And the attempt to lay a part of these foundations was the responsibility that this Committee assumed. It confidently believes that no comprehensive program can be developed until the issues as presented are settled and the functions of the several educational units are determined.

The task of finding what the issues are, of ascertaining and of fairly presenting the arguments for both alternatives, of agreeing on the one that seems best, all things considered, for our democratic society, and to some extent of indicating their implications for practice was assumed. The last phase, the consequent implementation, could not be satisfactorily treated in the life of this Committee, and it is hoped that other groups will be formed for continuing the work. The challenge to lay wide and sound bases for the program for the care and education of youth is before us and must be accepted by professional leaders. It is not spectacular; it does not lead to immediate direction for definite changes; and it is exceedingly difficult and tedious. For these reasons there are those who would dodge the responsibility, who would continue the attempt to build parts of a structure without first insuring that the foundations are substantially laid. Such persons should continue their efforts, for their contributions, if sound, can later be used in erecting the eventual structure; but the Committee, after three years of thought on the problem that it assumed, is of the unanimous opinion that its work has furnished an important contribution to the essential foundation for the eventual program.

The surest beginning of efforts that will lead to the new comprehensive program for the care and education of youth is fundamental thinking by the profession. It has been involved during the past two decades in an orgy of fact-collecting, much of which has been remotely, if at all, related

to problems that are important to a program that is actual or even desirable. Great credit should be given to the collection of facts that have pragmatic values; nothing of importance can be done without such facts. But reflection on published studies will show not only that they have had far less influence on practice than the labor in assembling them would reasonably lead one to expect, but also that they have been uncoordinated in plan and without obvious intent to contribute to the solution of the more important problems. Instead of "wild-catting," investigators need to be directed to the coöperative development of fields that are known to be important and promising. Consideration of the discussion of the issues and of the functions will furnish an abundance of problems that will challenge research workers to profitable endeavor for some years to come.

Similarly, during the past decade or two teachers and administrators have been encouraged to experiment. Experimentation is essential to safe progress. But for three reasons experimentation in education has been disappointing. In the first place, much of it has not been sound in planning or in procedure. Many schools have "experimented,"—that is, have tried something novel—without using a technique that would insure the revelation of results that can safely be accepted either by the directors or by others. In the second place, many experiments, even those using sound techniques, have not been concerned with problems of fundamental importance. There is great need for real experimentation coördinated to contribute to the solution of the problems that affect the very bases of organization, administration, curriculum, and method. And, finally, there is no widespread conscience among educators to use the findings of carefully evaluated experiments. In no other professional field do we find so few attempts to test the techniques of experimentation, to repeat the project under controlled conditions, and to apply the results to the practical problems of the schools. The report of the Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education should serve in the next few years to challenge and to direct much experimentation of the soundest kind, especially that which deals with the larger areas of educational practice.

This report is intended to turn the thinking of all professionally-minded teachers and administrators toward the basic problems of the education of youth. Not only that, it is hoped that the profession will bring the discussion to the attention of the public so that they too will be aware of

fundamental matters of educational policy. The report presents an ideal to be worked toward, not a series of proposals that should receive legislation before both the profession and the laity understand and are ready to support them. It should go without saying that as conditions change there may be needed changes, minor or radical, in the program that the report suggests and advocates.

Although it will be tempting to consider one or another of the issues by itself, the report should be read as a whole; at least, all of the issues with the recommendations should be kept in mind during the consideration of any one of them. In other words, there is a unity in the ten issues taken together. Some of the ten will be variously considered more important than others, as they well may be in different localities. There is a reason, too, for the general order in which they are presented. But this need not be over-emphasized. The more important point is the coordinated contribution of all the discussions to the program as a whole.

In the beginning of the report it is argued that society not only should but eventually must provide for the continued education of all adolescents, and that it should retain the discretionary power of terminating or of modifying the kind of education—or, in some relatively few instances, of the care—that it provides. It is then argued that this responsibility is for the purpose of preserving and of promoting the interests of society itself, and that therefore all education and care shall be consciously, consistently, and skillfully directed toward this end. Each individual must be first socially integrated that the purposes of education may be achieved. The next issue considers the extent to which the curriculum shall be common to all youth and to what extent differentiated, coming to the conclusion that objectives desired for all can be achieved only by differentiated means. Then there is consideration of the extent to which differentiated education shall concern itself with preparation for vocations, a matter in which our schools vary tremendously and illogically. Closely related is the discussion of the sixth issue, which advocates that the curriculum of the secondary school shall in so far as possible be good to the extent to which it is pursued, that acceptance of this principle really affords the best preparation for advanced study as well as for life activities. Naturally the next consideration is of the type of organization of learning units, and the report advocates extension of the principle of integration that has gained success in both elementary schools

and graduate institutions. It is a short step to the discussion of the next issue, which argues for the extension of the program to include education for ideals and attitudes as well as for knowledge and skills. Consideration of what attitudes and ideals should be taught involves the whole matter of democracy and its use of the schools to achieve the acceptance of the practice of the principles on which it rests. And, finally, the report argues for a greater degree of articulation than now exists so that education may be a "gradual, continuous, unitary process" as long as an individual remains in school.

Uses to be Made of the Report. As already stated, it is hoped that this report will serve as an important means of turning the minds of the profession to a consideration of what are considered to be the fundamental issues of secondary education. If there are other such issues, they too should be considered. Both administrators and teachers, knowing that these issues exist and the arguments on the side of each alternative, should become thoroughly convinced that one or the other is sound. Then they should challenge themselves to find what the implications of the accepted positions are, what expansions or other changes are indicated as necessary in the school or schools for which they are responsible. Naturally there will be obstacles to a new program, and consideration should be given to how they can be overcome. Professional leadership in any community will be manifested not by finding or by raising obstacles, but by ingenuity in inventing means for overcoming them. Even though it may not be possible to achieve the full ideal in any school, any approximation will be a contribution to progress. A consideration of these issues may well be made an important part of the program of teachers' meetings, formal and informal, in all parts of the country. Leadership can find no better challenge than concerning teachers with these matters and working out with them a new program based on wide decisions.

Preparation for consideration of these issues by the teachers of individual schools can be made in groups of secondary-school principals and of others especially interested in matters fundamental to education. There are already numerous groups of such leaders, some in large cities and many others with a membership that come together periodically in some convenient center for considering problems of common interest. Many more such informal groups could profitably be organized for discussing these and other similar problems. It is but natural to expect that such groups will

be able by the exchange of opinion to arrive at wiser conclusions and plans than any individual unaided could do. Thus every member of a group could go before the teachers of his own school with more abundant and sound ideas. We can scarcely expect the public to be interested in a new educational program until the profession itself has first clarified its ideas and has developed a devotion to ideals that it thinks should be worked toward.

Although the report will seem at first reading to be remote from immediate practice, it furnishes the foundation on which any comprehensive program must be built. New conditions have, as everyone knows, brought into secondary schools for lengthened periods a large number of youth who formerly either did not enter at all or who remained for a relatively short time. What the policy of secondary education should be regarding such youth can wisely be determined only if a positive and basically sound position has been taken on these issues. It is here suggested that the larger the social or political unit that can be involved in determining the policy, the better. Such a policy must be concerned with the admission of all youth, the period for which each one is to be retained, the basic purpose for which they are accepted and educated, the kinds of curriculum that should be offered, the scope that the new education should embrace, and the articulation of all units of the school system. These are all intensely practical matters, and no one of them can be soundly improved until first the issues have been decided.

It has long been convincingly argued that our traditional and more or less usual program of secondary education for such students as were enrolled before the beginning of this decade was by no means satisfactory. But in an era of abundance the public was not sufficiently concerned to force a profession satisfied with physical growth and occupied with routines to attempt the formulation of a new and adequate program. The public is no longer unconcerned, though it is still too ignorant of the facts to be active in forcing intelligent reforms. It has, however, reduced appropriations and forced many changes, the majority of which probably being unwise and detrimental to the education that should be contributing positively to the preservation and to the improvement of society. It is high time that the profession manifested the leadership which would have thwarted the pressure for unwise changes, that would indicate the lines along which the public must appropriate funds to make progress possible. The

new program for the academic type of pupil, however highly selected, must be based on the preferred alternatives of most of the issues, whether it is considered alone or, as must be the case, along with the program for all youth of whatever natural or acquired gifts and inclinations. This fact again makes the report the foundation of practicality.

All of the preceding leads to the inevitable conclusion that it will be necessary after the profession has faced the issues and decided on the alternatives that are sound for it to popularize them with the public. That is the basis of the democratic theory. It is too much, of course, to expect that every citizen can be made to concern himself with such general and apparently remote principles; but it is only reasonable to expect professional leadership to bring them to the attention of those citizens who are both intelligent and willing to assume responsibility for determining the policies and the program of education. The larger that fraction is, the more sound the foundation for the new program will be, the more intelligent hospitality the public will manifest toward proposals for bettering the care and education of youth, and the more likelihood of securing appropriations adequate to make it possible. A profession first itself convinced not only of the importance of these issues but also of the soundness in a democratic society of the preferred alternatives will be ingenious to inform the public about them and to convince a potent number to think fundamentally about elementary principles that will determine what the program can and must be. The worthiness of educators for leadership will be manifested by the extent to which they popularize such matters as are treated in this report and thus secure the only sure foundation for sound construction.

Finally, it should be repeated that the conclusions of this report have no official sanction. It is not desired that they should have. The purpose, from a democratic point of view far wiser, is to arouse the profession to consider the foundations of education, to impel them to face these fundamental issues, to keep thinking about them, and to give reasons why one alternative or the other seems to those who have given the matter much study wiser for the development of an education that will lead to a better and a safer democracy. Even when the public has not been sufficiently informed and aroused to take a stand on the issues, it is believed that the conclusions and recommendations will furnish the material with which attacks on progressive proposals can be met and

defeated. It is far better, however, to prepare the public to support a new program than constantly to have to leave the advancing column and fight off rear attacks. If the majority of the public can be led to enroll under the banner of progress by understandingly approving the principles herein presented, the attacks by ignorant or selfish minorities will decrease both in number and in potency.

Some leaders who are inclined to accept all of the foregoing will be discouraged by their belief that the present staffs of secondary schools contain too few teachers who themselves are concerned with the fundamental principles of education. It is true that there are many teachers who are immature, who are insufficiently informed of or concerned with such matters, and who feel that they are overloaded with the requirements of their daily traditional duties. But how are they to be made professionally minded without the leadership of their administrative officers? How are they to share in the responsibility for preserving and promoting education that it, in turn, can preserve and promote the interests of a democratic society unless they first are made concerned with, intelligent about, and profoundly convinced of the importance of having sound basic principles for the inevitable new program for the care and education of youth? If an administrator or a teacher can not be brought to this position, he should no longer be entrusted with the responsibility of a position in the educational system.

What Remains to be Done. This report on the issues of secondary education will be followed by a second on the functions, the manuscript for which will be ready for the press in a few months. But the two reports together are but a beginning of what must be done. There is need for consideration, by one or more other committees with more time and larger resources, of the implementation of the recommendations. What practically needs to be done, what are the obstacles, and how can they be overcome?

These reports are addressed primarily to the leaders of thought about secondary education, whether they are within or without the profession, whether they are administrators, supervisors, or classroom teachers. Those who are truly leaders will courageously accept the challenge to clarify their own thinking and to fortify their own convictions. Then, as already suggested, they will popularize these fundamentals with others both within and without the profession, so that

the number of potential leaders may be increased. Each recommendation should be studied by college and university classes in education, by teachers in their meetings, and by intelligent groups and individuals among the laity. They need to convince themselves which road is the sound and the necessary one for democratic society to follow. Then they will ask what procedure is indicated as ideally desirable and what is possible under the handicaps that are present in the community. The important thing is not to find obstacles, but to find how to overcome them. Something in the way of improvement can be done immediately in any community, and clarification of the need, if it is kept constantly in the public consciousness, will make a gradual approach to the ideal possible. From such study of these reports there will emerge the necessity of other committees. Certainly in preparation for a unified program for education, committees should consider similar problems on the level of elementary and of college education. The more study that is given to these reports, the more need will be felt for expert groups with adequate resources to formulate plans for building on these foundations. Isolated individuals and small groups can do something, can do much indeed; but it is only common sense to realize that there are limits beyond which they cannot go under the handicap of regularly performing their daily duties. The more they attempt, the more likelihood that the profession will realize the need of committees of experts who can give their entire time to proposing a detailed program for the new education. It is the failure of this widespread professional intelligence that has resulted in a Federal program that is as superficial as it is expensive.

Much is hoped for from the American Council on Education Commission on the Care and Education of Youth. It is reported to have the promise of munificent resources from the General Education Board, and it has already published a program of its agenda that is comprehensive and concerned with fundamental matters. The profession, especially as represented by this Department, should furnish this project its hearty coöperation. But that in itself is not sufficient. Public secondary-school men should not be content merely to give sympathy and coöperation as they are asked for by an altruistic but not a representative public professional group. They should know what is needed and supply not only ideas for the new program but also a steady pressure to see that it is comprehensive in nature and fundamental in conception. The

work that is proposed by the American Council should have been undertaken by the leaders of secondary education supplied with public funds. As our democratic society has not been convinced that it should supply the necessary resources, the benevolent project should be not only welcomed and supported but also directed by such pressure of professional influence as cannot be neglected.

THOMAS H. BRIGGS, *Chairman.*

ISSUES OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

It is especially notable in our history that provision was so early made for secondary education. But the pride with which we have celebrated the phenomenon should not blind us to the fact that it was for a long time provided in only a few localities and for a very small number of highly selected boys, that it was frankly and fully imitative of an institution already a relic of largely outgrown needs in a civilization far different from that in America, and that it had and could have had small significance to the pioneer people. It did prevent learning of a sort from being buried in the grave of our fathers, but at the same time it stifled the imagination of educators and made them content to follow already outworn practices without planning soundly and comprehensively for what the New World needed.

Proposals for improvement and for adaptations to the demands of new conditions were few, spaced at long intervals, and, except for those by Benjamin Franklin in the middle of the eighteenth century, singularly small and lacking in inventiveness to meet new needs. Although the academies made wide curricular experimentation, there was a continuing lack of any attempt to prepare a sound, comprehensive, and long-sighted program for secondary education. This lack has continued to the present time. Although the several committees of the National Education Association have made valuable contributions, the need for agreement on fundamental principles and definitions of secondary education in our country is today almost as great as it ever was. This need is especially imperative in light of the many and significant changes that have come in our civilization.

American Secondary Education As a National Enterprise.

During the two generations that have elapsed since the *Kalamazoo* decision by the Supreme Court of Michigan, which upheld "the right of school authorities . . . to levy taxes upon the general public for the support of what in this State are known as high schools," such schools have undergone extraordinary changes. Many of those changes have been so clearly apparent to every interested observer that they need only the barest recital to bring them to mind—the tremendous growth in the numbers and in the proportions of youth with whose

educational needs the high schools have been concerned, the great increase in the heterogeneity of the pupil population, the corresponding expansion in the number and variety of the schools' educational offerings, the increasing elaboration of physical plants and equipment.

Certain other major changes have occurred which superficially are less apparent. At least one of these latter changes is, nevertheless, of fundamental importance. The nature and scope of the education provided by the high school are no longer, as they may perhaps have seemed to be in 1874, matters chiefly of local concern. They are no longer, even, matters chiefly of state concern. The provision of public secondary education has come to be so thoroughly interwoven with the general social program of America, and the effects of secondary schooling have come to bear so directly on almost every phase of American life, that whatever the basis for its financial support, secondary education must today be regarded as essentially a national concern and responsibility, with control vested chiefly in the communities where the schools are located. Under present conditions the Committee would oppose Federal control.

Defects in the National Program. Judged as an outgrowth of a developing national policy, the existing system of secondary education in the United States can not escape serious adverse criticism. American secondary schools exhibit all too clearly the fundamental defects that must characterize any enterprise which has been allowed to grow almost fortuitously. Secondary education in the United States now, as in the past, is guided, as a whole, by no clearly formulated plan; it rests on no carefully conceived and fully envisaged educational philosophy; it has achieved no consistent standards by which to evaluate its own endeavors. Although it has to its credit great and unique achievements, it is, as a result of these lacks, inefficient, wasteful of public resources, sometimes even definitely prejudicial of the public good. These defects are the more significant in that social and economic conditions seem to call now, as never before, for carefully formulated plans of action in all matters which fundamentally affect the national interest. Education at least should have an intelligent, comprehensive, and longsighted plan. As it is the chief means that society has to preserve and to better itself, it can not be left to undirected and sporadic growth. The need for an exact and comprehensive definition of the American program of secondary education

may fairly be regarded as among the most important of the problems which now confront the nation. Although emphasized during the recent years of economic depression, the problem is no more serious now than it has been for many years, and it would become no less so if we dwelt in an elysium of plenty.

The criticisms of the indefiniteness of a general program should not blind any one to the pioneering, not infrequently of high ingenuity, although it has been without the chart that would have made these independent efforts far more economical and effective. It should not fail, either, to recognize the devoted work of thousands upon thousands of teachers who have labored faithfully according to their lights, many of them continually hoping that a pillar of fire would appear to make clear the direction in which they should go. It does not fail in its faith that the secondary schools of the United States, with all of their shortcomings, have done more than those in any other country to elevate the intellectual standard of the population as a whole, to afford a wholesome atmosphere in which youth might flower, and measurably to prepare for the needs brought about by a steadily changing civilization. With such recognition of merit, which might with justice be easily extended, the Committee looks forward to possibilities of far greater effectiveness on the part of this important agency of society.

The Purpose of this Report. This report sets forth results of an attempt to establish the groundwork of a national program. Critical examination of current educational practice in the United States reveals numerous inherent fundamental conflicts—of theory with theory, of theory with practice, of one type of practice with another. That such conflicts exist is perhaps a less serious matter than is the fact that in many instances they have been allowed to exist unrecognized. To bring the more important conflicts to light may well constitute the first step in an effort to improve the present educational system. To suggest which possible alternative in a given conflict is the more in harmony with the major social ideals of America and to indicate the educational procedure which adherence to this alternative would dictate, is a second step. Both these steps were undertaken by the Committee.

Major Issues in American Secondary Education. Search for the conflicts which seem most vitally to affect secondary

education in the United States at the present time has revealed ten such conflicts of major importance. Stated as issues and listed in the order in which they are discussed in the following pages, the ten are as follows:

1. Shall secondary education be provided at public expense for all normal individuals or for only a limited number?

2. Shall secondary education seek to retain all pupils in school as long as they wish to remain, or shall it transfer them to other agencies under educational supervision when, in the judgment of the school authorities, these agencies promise to serve better the pupils' immediate and probable future needs?

3. Shall secondary education be concerned only with the welfare and progress of the individual, or with these only as they promise to contribute to the welfare and progress of society?

4. Shall secondary education provide a common curriculum for all, or differentiated offerings?

5. Shall secondary education include vocational training, or shall it be restricted to general education?

6. Shall secondary education be primarily directed toward preparation for advanced studies, or shall it be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses, regardless of a student's future academic career?

7. Shall secondary education accept conventional school subjects as fundamental categories under which school experiences shall be classified and presented to students, or shall it arrange and present experiences in fundamental categories directly related to the performance of such functions of secondary schools in a democracy as increasing the ability and the desire better to meet socio-civic, economic, health, leisure-time, vocational, and pre-professional problems and situations?

8. Shall secondary education present merely organized knowledge, or shall it also assume responsibility for attitudes and ideals?

9. Shall secondary education seek merely the adjustment of students to prevailing social ideals, or shall it seek the reconstruction of society?

10. Granting that education is a "gradual, continuous, unitary process," shall secondary education be presented merely as a phase of such a process, or shall it be organized as a distinct but closely articulating part of the entire educational program, with peculiarly emphasized functions of its own?

The Need for Consistent Definition of Terms. The search which has brought to light these fundamental issues in secondary education has brought to light also the existence of widespread confusion in both popular and professional thinking because of the varying terms in which the issues are discussed. Differences in the definitions attached to certain common expressions seem especially to be responsible for this confusion. The definitions which most frequently lend themselves to misunderstanding are the definitions of "education" as a general term, and of "secondary education" as delimiting a particular phase of education in general. To avoid confusion in the use of these terms in the following discussion, the meaning which each of the terms is intended to convey needs to be set down in some detail.

"Education" Defined. "Education," as the term is used in this discussion, implies every *phase of the process by which society as a whole, or any of its agencies, consciously seeks to develop socially significant abilities and characteristics in its members.*

Certain present-day writers on education have used the word "education" to signify a single type of teaching, that which seeks to foster an intellectually dynamic view of the world through study of the great classical philosophies, and thus to preserve the "great tradition." As it is here used, the term "education" is not intended to apply merely to the development of the classical outlook. It covers as well the development of whatever other outlooks may be held to give significance to an interpretation of the world's phenomena of all important kinds; and in addition it applies to the inculcation of all sorts of useful habits and skills—the development of habits of caring properly for the body, for example, or of specific technical abilities of a vocational sort—which certain critics of modern schools would not include under the term "education" because the habits and skills in question are based in considerable degree on non-intellectual "training."

The term is here employed, however, with less breadth of meaning than is given it by those who regard the whole of life as synonymous with education. One's every experience may obviously be a source of learning. But while "education" is here considered to embrace experiences afforded by other agencies than the school—the home, the church, the public press, and the theatre, for example—only those experiences provided by society with the conscious intent of producing learning are here regarded as a part of education.

"Secondary Education" Defined. "Secondary education" is used in the present instance to denote *the education provided by schools for the purpose of guiding and promoting the development of normal individuals for whom on the one hand the elementary school no longer constitutes a satisfactory environment, and who on the other hand are either not yet prepared to participate effectively in society unguided by the school, or are not ready for the specialized work of the professional schools or the upper division of the liberal arts college.*

Society is responsible for the care and development of all children and youth from birth until they are able to fit successfully into social life and to discharge individually, without constant tutorial direction, their social responsibilities. The responsibilities of maturity cannot be cast upon the immature. Society should assume the responsibility of caring for the normal child through the home into which he is born, so ordering economic life that the parents of the child may, through honest work, provide adequate support to promote the child's physical and intellectual growth. For the irresponsible, the illegitimate, and the orphan, society must provide special institutional care or parental oversight in homes suited to the needs of these individual cases. The child of normal intelligence in this group should be cared for in the public school; the entire needs of the sub-normal child may be met by the institution charged with his support.

Criticisms of American secondary schools are frequently based on comparisons of American with European secondary education as if "secondary education" means substantially the same thing in this country and abroad. Under most European systems of school organization, secondary schools are distinguished from other schools for pupils at a given stage of educational advancement, both by the type of instruction offered and by the types of pupils served. Whereas certain European schools, not there called "secondary," are intended as schools for the people, and are devoted to instruction of a nature supposedly appropriate to the common citizen, European secondary schools have been definitely planned as schools for the ruling class—the socially, economically, or intellectually *élite*. Secondary education thus constitutes in European eyes both a special kind of education and the education of a special class of pupils.

Secondary education is in this report intended to suggest no such distinctions. The American school system has so developed that at the present time no major branch of the

system is set apart from the rest on the European basis. Whether a branch of the system *should* be set apart on some such basis may admittedly be regarded as a moot question. But in a discussion of American secondary education as it now exists, the term "secondary education" must properly be interpreted as applying to widely varying kinds of education provided for an increasingly heterogeneous body of pupils.

The term as it is here used is not intended, moreover, to suggest distinctions based on the nature of the various intellectual processes involved in learning. Students of education have from time to time attempted to define secondary education on a psychological basis. Perhaps the most widely quoted definition of this sort is to the effect that that period of education "can properly and accurately be termed 'secondary' . . . in which the pupil is capable of learning through study and the use of books but is incapable of systematic personal growth, except under the constant tutorial presence and constraint of the teacher."¹ Valuable as such definitions may be in the development of criteria for teaching, they have the defect that they must inevitably apply to various stages of the teaching process or to the teaching of certain groups of pupils at almost every level from the early elementary grades to the graduate school of the university. For present purposes it seems inadvisable to use the term "secondary education" to cover so broad a range.

Finally, secondary education is not intended to imply a type of education inherently distinguished by its suitability for adolescents. Adolescents will inevitably constitute the great majority of those who attend our secondary schools, and the materials and methods of secondary education ought accordingly to be adapted to their needs. Recent studies of adolescent boys and girls have thrown serious doubt, however, on the theory that adolescence *per se* demands a unique type of methods or materials. Moreover, pupils at various stages of adolescence are so distributed through the school system as to prevent thorough-going adaptation of instruction to them as a group, even were such adaptation necessary and desirable.² Hence secondary education cannot be accurately identified by its peculiar pertinence for such pupils.

The meaning which the term "secondary education" is

¹H. C. Morrison: *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School* (Revised Edition), p. 7. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

²For a summary of the existing evidence on both these points, see F. D. Brooks: *The Psychology of Adolescence*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1929.

here intended to convey would be wholly arbitrary except for the fact that it has the sanction of wide practical usage. Secondary education is defined, in substance, as the schooling appropriate to normal individuals who have done with the elementary school but who are not ready for specialized "higher" training or for vocational employment.

In terms of school grades, secondary education thus begins with the work of grade seven under the organization now widely accepted as appropriate for the American school system. Ideally, it ends in the case of a given individual either when he leaves school prepared to be self-supporting and self-directive, or when he completes the level of work ordinarily provided in the first two years of the under-graduate college. It includes the education offered by all schools for normal pupils (adults as well as adolescents) within these grade-limits—vocational schools, specialized technical schools, part-time and continuation schools, evening schools and schools for adults, as well as cosmopolitan high schools. It includes also the education provided in junior colleges, since there would seem to be no ground for making any fundamental distinction between junior-college work and high-school work immediately preceding the junior college.

In terms of educational functions, secondary education finds its goal in carrying forward the educational process which the elementary school has begun to a point at which that process has been completed for some individuals or at which it can advantageously be taken over for others by higher institutions. The elementary school necessarily devotes itself chiefly, so far as concerns its academic goals, to developing the fundamental understandings and skills which should be common to all citizens. The secondary school, continuing this task, assumes responsibility also for discovering and fostering the differentiated abilities of its individual pupils. It yields this responsibility to higher schools at a point as yet loosely established, but marked in general by the beginning of distinctively "professional" or "scholarly" studies.

Secondary Education and the "Normal" Individual. The fact should perhaps be emphasized that "secondary education" as thus defined, and as the term is used throughout this discussion, implies whatever education may be appropriate to *normal* individuals. In a sense, there is nothing new in this emphasis. Schools for abnormal pupils—mental defectives, for example—have long been considered apart from the usual

provisions for secondary education. School officials frequently display a tendency, however, to beg the question of what "normal" means. They are prone to identify the normal pupil on the basis of acceptable school progress in a conventional curriculum on the one hand, or of a satisfactory rank in some standardized test of intelligence on the other. The latter determinant, though usually more reliable than the former, is in essence practically the same as the former; most of the tests of general intelligence now in common use have been principally validated by the criterion of school success. Thus, whichever means of identification is used, the normal pupil is held to be the pupil who is likely to succeed in school. But to hold that the secondary school should concern itself with normal pupils, and that normal pupils are those who will do well in the secondary schools, seems little more than an interesting variant of chasing the squirrel round the tree. Normal must be defined in non-school terms if it is to provide an acceptable criterion for the selection of secondary-school pupils.

The soundest criterion of normality is obviously that of success in out-of-school contacts. In speaking of secondary education as a type of education appropriate to normal pupils, therefore, it is here assumed that normality is defined in terms of this criterion, rather than in terms either of intelligence test results or of school achievement. To put the definition positively, a "*normal individual*" is assumed to be *one who takes, or who as a result of his development may reasonably be expected to take, an acceptable part in those out-of-school groups to which he naturally belongs under the conditions of American society*; and secondary education is whatever school education seems best adapted to the needs of such an individual at a certain stage in his educational progress.

The Achievement of a National Program of Secondary Education. If by "education" in general and "secondary education" in particular are understood the kinds of provisions here suggested, a certain common ground is available from which to consider the current issues in secondary education.

These issues are examined in detail in the following sections of this report. Each issue has been analyzed to determine why, under present conditions, it actually is an issue. In each case the alternatives by which the issue may be resolved have been carefully considered. Finally, the more appropriate alternative has been chosen for each issue in turn—more appropriate from the standpoint not merely of theoretic-

cal considerations but of practical feasibility as well; and the means by which this alternative may be put into effect have been in part set forth to show how the desired educational program may be achieved.

It is not to be expected that there will be immediate or universal agreement with the approved alternatives. For the present, diversity in theory and practice among those in charge of American secondary schools is bound to continue; and no doubt there should always be a certain amount of such diversity. Except for purposes of experiment, however, one definite alternative in connection with each of the fundamental issues must be agreed on and adopted by American secondary schools in general before the nation as a nation can have a consistent educational policy. This report makes definite proposals with respect to these alternatives. The proposals will, it is hoped, stimulate widespread and constructive thinking, leading eventually to an improvement of educational practice.

In its examination of basic issues in secondary education the report raises, and is intended to raise, two specific questions: *Do not the proposals here set forth constitute a desirable and practicable basis for the development of American secondary education? If they fail in this respect, what other proposals are likely to be more desirable and equally practicable?*

S

P

s

b

c

n

a

t

a

t

c

n

i

t

s

I

i

c

s

s

s

c

k

s

i

t

t

t

w

w

b

ISSUE I

Shall secondary education be provided at public expense for all normal individuals or for only a limited number?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

Equality of educational opportunity must mean comparatively little to the 3,000,000 boys and girls of secondary-school age in America who are not now in school, unless it be the irony of calling something free which they do not or cannot have. Conversely, equality of educational opportunity must mean little to many thousands of those who are actually in school, unless it be the irony of having something which they do not want or cannot use.

The present situation in the nation's schools is no acceptable answer to the question of whether a secondary education at public expense shall be the heritage of every American boy and girl. The unresolved conflicts in theory which mark contemporary educational thought may sharpen the issue, but they provide no solution either. American education can determine its eventual policy only by reaching substantial and effective agreement on three fundamental points. Is universal secondary education necessary and appropriate in our society? Can it be both universal and effective? And can the nation afford it?

Almost no one doubts the pure desirability of universal secondary education. If we believe that economic and social stability depends upon enlightened and productive citizenship, and if we believe that civic virtue in a democratic society depends upon a common will toward progress and the knowledge of how to make that will effective toward specific social goals, then we must conceive as the major educational instrument a secondary school that functions for all.

Less certain is whether a program of secondary education can be both universal and effective. Experience tells us that there comes a point where diminishing educational returns set in, and that this point occurs for some pupils within the secondary school. But until educators have tried whole-heartedly to correct the defects of the present system by better planning and more resourceful leadership, they

cannot conscientiously concede that a universal program cannot be reasonably effective. The results achieved by the best of our secondary schools demonstrate that the possible values of an extended program have by no means been exhausted.

Statistics show plainly enough that the necessary money or productive capacity for an extended program can be provided if the public is willing to divert it to the support of the schools and if a more equitable tax system can be devised to raise it. As soon as educators have made their own schools efficient, they can proceed freely, as many of them are already doing, to the imperative work of pointing out to the public that more education would be self-liquidating because it would increase the nation's ability to pay for it and because it would preclude the mischievous and expensive situation America must eventually suffer if large numbers of youth are left unprepared for a constructive life.

There may be great difficulties in extending the program of education—Who would expect otherwise?—but there is nothing fundamentally unsound or inconsistent in a vigorous and resourceful educational profession moving toward a system of universal education that would function for all.

I. THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

Present Practice in America. The census of 1930 reported that slightly more than half of the children of high-school age in the United States were attending school. The present enrollment is probably close to 70 per cent. This is by far the highest per cent enrolled in secondary schools by any nation in the history of the world.

What happens to the remaining 30 per cent is not accurately known. Theoretically none are excluded from secondary schools. The most common factors which cause children to leave school are probably inferior economic or racial status and academic intelligence, coupled with maladjustment in the prevailing curricula of secondary schools. Many live in backward rural or negro areas where secondary education either is not available or is of such poor quality that its advantages are questionable. Even in cities where secondary education is theoretically provided for all, inferior economic and racial status still operates as a powerful selective factor. Counts showed in 1922 that under existing social conditions high schools were able to give a better chance to

the children of economically superior groups, and that the emphasis placed on class distinctions increased with each higher school grade.¹ The National Survey of Secondary Education, partially repeating in 1930 Counts's study, showed that high schools continued to reflect class distinctions.² The tremendous influx of pupils into secondary schools since 1930 has doubtless erased such distinctions in numerous individual schools, but economic and racial status must inevitably operate as a powerful selective factor until secondary education becomes universal. The poorer children want money to buy luxuries which their more favored companions enjoy, and are easily tempted by even short-term employment. Many have to contribute to the support of their families. Graduation from high school is not so essential to family prestige in the lower economic groups, and many foreign-born parents, retaining the European peasant's conception of secondary education, doubtless do not dream of it for their children. Negro and Asiatic parents in many sections of the country must share this feeling.

Another powerful selective factor is inferior academic intelligence. Terman states that a pupil must have an intelligence quotient of at least 110 to be reasonably sure of success in the conventional high school, and approximately 60 per cent of our youth make a score less than that. Such pupils are not deliberately excluded from secondary schools, but continual failure in school work, accompanied by the disapproval of parents and teachers, makes a disagreeable situation from which many are undoubtedly glad to escape.

Maladjustment for many reasons in the prevailing curricula of secondary schools is a third powerful selective factor. These curricula usually involve sitting on hard chairs four or five hours a day, reading and writing, discussing and reciting, learning the facts of history, grammar, science, mathematics, and the like. Tension is created by severe competition in which many children are destined never to succeed, and by high standards of academic achievement which they can never meet. Normal social communication and coöperation are forbidden. It is no wonder that many children rebel against this regime with almost hysterical violence and drop out of school.

¹G. S. Counts: *The Selective Character of American Secondary Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.

²G. N. Kefauver, V. H. Noll, and C. E. Drake: *The Secondary-School Population*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 4. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

These considerations serve to define the issue with which we are dealing. We are not thinking in romantic terms of opening golden doors of opportunity to millions of eager and intelligent children to whom the blessings of secondary education are now denied. We are considering the desirability of extending secondary education over backward rural and negro areas and to pupils of limited intelligence and background. For many years to come we can not hope to provide for these pupils anything which a professor in a teachers college would recognize as education. In the backward areas we must think in terms of small schools taught by boys and girls just out of college, whose education will probably make them incapable of dealing realistically with the needs of their pupils, receiving a salary of thirty to fifty dollars a month, and graduating to other employment after one or two years of service if they have any ability or ambition. Such are the inevitable beginnings of the broadened educational program with which the issue is concerned.

In the city schools we must think of the further extension of educational opportunities not only in terms of larger schools and more teachers, but in terms of enabling and encouraging all boys and girls to attend school.

Along with these matters we must consider the extension and improvement of our present program of secondary education so that the children who are now in school may have an education more appropriate to their needs and interests. If our present figures are correct, our secondary schools in the past five years have somehow provided for almost two million extra pupils in facilities designed for five million. There has been little new building, teaching staffs have actually been reduced, and expenditures have been drastically curtailed. This means that while our schools should have made a sudden adaptation to a more heterogeneous population than they have ever before attempted to educate, they have had to return to a more formal, uniform program, eliminating numerous elements that might have given the new arrivals in school an education more suited to their needs. To provide an appropriate education for these children and for three million other children of high-school age who are not now in school is the responsibility we undertake if we favor universal secondary education.

The Ideal of Free Public Secondary Education. American public school people in general seem to be convinced of the

soundness of the attempt to provide universal—or nearly universal—secondary education at public expense. Their ideals for the public secondary school have been variously expressed. Giving voice to professional sentiment, Norton, in writing on the question "Should all our children go to high school?" answers that question in the affirmative: "It is no longer safe to look on high-school education as the privilege of a selected few. A high-school education is as essential in the twentieth century as a grammar school education was in the nineteenth."³ Judd defends an "expansionist" attitude toward the secondary school, declaring himself in favor of "a system of secondary education which has universal accessibility and maximum flexibility."⁴ The points of view of numerous other individuals and professional groups are well summed up in the recommendation of the recent National Conference on the Financing of Education: "That universal education suited to the needs of groups and individuals be provided and required at public expense for youth of all ages from early childhood until such time as proper employment is advisable and obtainable."⁵

Universal Secondary Education Opposed on Financial Grounds. Among leaders of lay opinion and among educators not directly associated with the work of the public schools, there is less general agreement with this view. The great majority of parents of high-school pupils have no doubt felt that their sons and daughters have been enjoying advantages never open to themselves; hence they have tended to accept without serious question the educational program advocated by school officials. Numerous disinterested laymen, moreover, have warmly supported the efforts of professional educators to extend the present provisions for secondary education. But citizens whose interest in educational policy has centered elsewhere than in the opportunities provided for their own children have frequently voiced serious doubts as to the wisdom of the goals which the public secondary schools have set themselves to reach.

³J. K. Norton: *Should All Our Children Go to High School?* Bulletin of the Department of Secondary Education of the National Education Association No. 11, p. 21. (February, 1933).

⁴C. H. Judd: *The Unique Character of American Secondary Education*, pp. 60, 61. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

⁵Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education: *Reports of the National Conference on the Financing of Education*. Washington: National Education Association, 1933.

Adverse criticism of secondary school policy has been of various types.⁶ Most common at present, in view of the economic depression, is criticism based primarily on the cost of an extended program of public education. Current criticism from this standpoint was foreshadowed even before the depression by such documents as the report of the Junior Education and Employment Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. This report called for the "exclusion of a young person from the privileges of high school whenever it has been definitely established that he either cannot or will not use these agencies for truly educational purposes," and recommended "the amendment of compulsory educational acts to make the attainment of an adequate physical and mental development for the job sought, the test rather than the attainment of any chronological age in excess of fourteen arbitrarily selected."⁷

More recent criticism has been more destructive. Thus an editorial in *The Chicago Tribune* demands "further curtailment of unnecessary spending" in the secondary schools, on the ground that these schools represent "the luxury branch of the system."⁸ An anonymous writer in Baltimore declares: "The trend of modern 'education' in the United States is not only absurd, but it is in a measure responsible for some of the chaotic conditions in which the nation now flounders. Is it really incumbent upon the state (John Smith, Taxpayer) to furnish 'education' (so called) from the cradle to the grave?"⁹ Commenting on a tax bill in support of education which had been introduced in the South Carolina legislature, the *Charleston News and Courier* says: "The Spruill bill is wrong because the school system is wrong—because the attempted maintenance of free high schools and bus transportation is without foundation in principle and preposterously extravagant."¹⁰ An editorial writer in the same state reaches the ultimate in adverse criticism by a condemnation of the public-school system *in toto*: "The way back to the cash basis in public affairs, paying off all back debts and

⁶Much of the current criticism of secondary education is devoted to an attack on the so-called "fads and frills" which find a place in the high-school program. Since the issue under discussion has to do with the general policy of providing secondary education for all and not with the detailed content of that education, the criticisms here cited are restricted to examples of those which bear directly on the question of the desirability of universal education at public expense. The question of "fads and frills" is treated at length in the discussion of Issue IV.

⁷Junior Education and Employment Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers; *National Education and Employment Program*, pp. 7, 8, (September 5, 1927). New York (50 Church Street).

⁸Editorial: "For Educators Not Education." *Chicago Tribune* (May 17, 1933).

⁹Editorial: "From the Cradle to the Grave." *The Kalends* (house organ of the Waverly Press, Baltimore, Maryland), XII:2 (March, 1933).

¹⁰Editorial: "The Barefooted Lady," *Charleston, S. C., News and Courier*, 1933.

balancing the budget for all time to come, is to cut the length of the school terms and quit the running of so many school buses, using the money thus saved to pay off the deficits and settling the bonded debts. If the schools do not run long enough, let the parents do a little teaching at home. If the school houses are too far away, let the patrons do the hauling. If shortened terms for a number of years will not take care of the trouble, then stop the schools entirely and let weeds and grass have a chance to grow in the school grounds. Make temporary use of the old plan whereby each parent is responsible for the education and training of his own children. The private school is better anyway than the public school. It is under better control. It can begin and it can stop when necessity requires . . . Back debts will never be paid and we will never again be able to function with cash without cutting back on what we have foolishly tried to do in the matter of this public-school system."¹¹ There have also been numerous more reasoned arguments that our nation can not continue to pay for secondary education as it is, to say nothing of as it is proposed to be extended.

Universal Secondary Education Opposed on Theoretical Grounds. Concern with the underlying theory of free public education, rather than merely with the cost of education, has motivated a somewhat different type of criticism. Theoretical appraisals of the policy of universal public secondary education have been less numerous than have protests against the cost of the public schools; such appraisals have in general, however, been more searching in their analysis of defects than have criticisms based chiefly on economic considerations.

Thus Nock, in his evaluation of the fundamental assumptions on which American public education has been built, concludes that the system has been based on quite unsound premises. There has become evident, he says, "an irreconcilable disagreement between our equalitarian theory and the fact of experience. Our theory assumed that all persons are educable; our practical application of it simply showed that the Creator, in His wisdom and in His loving-kindness, had for some unsearchable reason not quite seen His way to fall in with our theory. for He had not made all persons educable. We found to our discomfiture that the vast majority of mankind have neither the force of intellect to apprehend the

¹¹Editorial: "The Way to Do It." *Horry County Herald* (Conway, S. C.) (May 26, 1932).

processes of education, nor the force of character to make an educational discipline prevail in their lives."¹²

Pritchett, in a survey some years ago of the increasingly heavy educational burden imposed by the attempt to provide universal schooling, advanced a similar criticism: The school "is no longer conceived as primarily an intellectual agency, but rather as an agency through which the child shall learn something of every form of knowledge in existence, and in which he is not only to absorb such a knowledge, but is to acquire the preparation for a trade or profession. . . . The school system has come to be looked upon as the door by which every boy and girl is to enter into some kind of calling that may afford the means of making a living. The conception that the public school is an agency in which any child may be taught any subject is fundamentally unsound . . ."¹³

And a recent writer in a popular magazine of national circulation likewise inveighs against the current theory of public education, though on different grounds. "To-day it is hard to find anywhere in the United States first-class carpenters or first-class masons or first-class cabinet-makers under forty years of age who are American born. A white-collared America has educated itself out of first-class mechanics and craftsmen . . ."¹⁴

Major Sources of Disagreement on the Issue. Though the foregoing quotations do not show all the varied criticisms to which the secondary school has been subject,¹⁵ they illustrate the major types of attack against which the policy of universal public secondary education may fairly be called on to justify itself. Notwithstanding the agreement of school people on certain theoretical goals, it is obvious that the issue as to what types of pupils should be provided for in the American secondary school has not been conclusively resolved. Study of numerous expressions of opinion on both sides of the issue suggests that disagreements with respect to it are due in principal measure to divergencies of opinion

¹²A. J. Nock: *The Theory of Education in the United States*, p. 55. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1932.

¹³H. S. Pritchett: "The Rising Cost of Education." *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, pp. 116-117. New York: The Carnegie Foundation, 1932.

¹⁴Edwin Lefevre: "Tax Blindness." *Saturday Evening Post*, 205: 3-5, 57 (January 28, 1933).

¹⁵The criticisms here summarized have been drawn solely from current discussions of secondary education. For a comprehensive analysis of earlier arguments for and against the public secondary school, see B. Jeannette Burrell and R. H. Eckelberry: "The Free Public High School in the Post-Civil-War Period." *School Review*, 42:606-14, 667-75 (October, November, 1934).

on certain fundamental questions. At least three such questions seem to be logically inherent in the issue.

First, there is the question as to whether a program of universal secondary education at public expense is necessary or appropriate in the American scheme of society. A positive answer is clearly implied in the statements by Norton and Judd, and in the recommendation of the National Conference on the Financing of Education. A negative answer is no less clearly implied—though it is seldom explicitly stated—in the criticisms of many who oppose the present system on theoretical grounds.

Second, there is the question as to whether—even granting its desirability—a program of universal secondary education can be devised which will be of positive benefit to the varied types of pupils who will be subject to it. The statement quoted from Nock seems to deny this possibility, though there is reason to believe that his criticism is founded rather upon a narrow definition of the term "education" than upon disbelief in the general advantages of schooling.¹⁶ The position taken by the protagonists of universal secondary education obviously assumes the possibility of universal benefit from such education on the part of normal individuals.

Third, there is the question as to whether America can finance whatever program of secondary education may seem theoretically desirable. On this question in particular the attention of the opponents of universal secondary education seems to center at the present time.

Each of these questions needs to be explicitly considered if the issue as to free public secondary education is to be soundly and conclusively met.

II. THE HISTORICAL SOURCE OF THE ISSUE

Need for Recognizing the Historical Background of the Issue. The questions underlying the issue of free public secondary education cannot be fairly examined without some attention to the historical background of the issue. The proposal that America should establish an educational system by which all boys and girls may be given secondary education at public expense is relatively recent. Only as one recognizes the developments which have led to this proposal can that underlying question, in particular, which deals with the ap-

¹⁶Cf. A. J. Nock, *op. cit.*, pp. 110 ff.

propriateness of such a system in the American scheme of living be understandingly answered.

Universal Secondary Education Not Envisaged in the Original American Ideal. Neither the Declaration of Independence of the American colonies nor the Constitution of the United States of America—despite the apparent implications of present-day flag-waving addresses—contains any explicit guarantee of universal “right” to education at public expense. At the time at which these documents were formulated, New England alone provided the beginnings of a publicly supported and publicly controlled school system. Schools in the other American colonies were largely privately supported and privately directed. Though they were open occasionally to pupils whose parents could not afford to pay the established fees for tuition, they were open to such pupils primarily on a charity basis. Even in New England, moreover, admission to publicly supported schools above the elementary grade was as a matter of course restricted to a highly selected group; there was no thought of offering free to all, merely as a prerogative of citizenship, an education which should go beyond the barest rudiments.

Nor was the conception of universal secondary education regarded at that time as a logical outgrowth of the democratic ideal. Far from believing that every American child should have the right to progress at public expense from the lowest rung of the educational ladder to the highest—or even to any particular rung set very far above the bottom—early educational theorists tended to accept without question the desirability of enforcing a rigid degree of selection in the educational process. Thus Thomas Jefferson, in his proposal of an educational program for the State of Virginia, suggested a scheme by which, at successive stages, only a few of the most promising scholars should annually be “raked from the rubbish” and sent on to study at public expense in higher schools.¹⁷ The conception that secondary education should be selective persisted without serious challenge, indeed, till the end of the nineteenth century. As recently as thirty years ago E. E. Brown, discussing the nature and purposes of secondary education, wrote: “Occasionally one hears the prophecy that what we call secondary education will eventually be an education for all. It is now the lower stage of the

¹⁷R. J. Honeywell: *The Educational Work of Thomas Jefferson*, p. 11, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931. Persons who believe a selective program of public education to be incompatible with American democratic principles will find Honeywell's presentation of Jefferson's views highly illuminating.

education that cannot be for all, and the stage in which differentiation according to the individual's prospective service to society, or according to the individual's peculiar tastes and capacities, or according to both of these together, finds its beginning."¹⁸

The conviction now held by many, that secondary education should be an education for all, has grown to its present strength within little more than the span of a single generation. It has been fostered by a two-fold change in American life since the beginning of the present century. On the one hand, social, industrial, and economic conditions have so altered in this country within the last thirty years that they seem to many observers to make necessary a kind and an amount of education for all which in previous generations were at best the privileges of the few. On the other hand, economic productivity on the part of adults has so greatly increased as to make possible a prolongation of the period of infancy—that is, of preliminary formal education—without imposing a serious economic burden. Not only is there at present no demand by industry for youth up to the age of eighteen; there is actually, except in a few vocations, no place for youth at all.

Recent Changes in the Need for Education. The belief that there has occurred in recent years a marked change in the need for education rests upon a recognition of developments outside the school which in outline are familiar to nearly everyone, but which are often thought of without regard to their implications for educational policy.¹⁹

Within the last thirty years, changes in the technical demands of industry and commerce upon their workers have made it almost impossible for boys and girls to gain employment which holds promise for the future without preliminary specialized training. Within this same period, changes in the conditions under which vocational pursuits are carried on have practically put an end to the acquirement of necessary preliminary training by means of the apprenticeship employment which used to be open to beginners. Though agriculture has not kept pace with industrial and commercial occupations in these respects, the business of farming and husbandry bids fair within a few years to become similarly exacting

¹⁸E. E. Brown: *The Making of Our Middle Schools*, p. 5, New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1903.

¹⁹For a more extended discussion of these developments than is presented here, see T. H. Briggs: *Secondary Education*, Chap. VII. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933. See also the President's Research Committee on Social Trends: *Recent Social Trends in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1933.

in its demands. Education above the elementary level would seem to be essential as a means of meeting these new requirements.

Within the last thirty years, developments in transportation, in communication, and in large-scale production have made the various sections of the United States increasingly interdependent economically. As the events of the depression have strikingly shown, no one section of the country can prosper irrespective of the good or ill fortunes of the other sections. Even in times of economic prosperity the existence of "backward" sections must inevitably lessen the prosperity of other sections; and whatever factors make anywhere in the nation for "backwardness"—the lack of appropriate education included—are matters of concern to the country as a whole. To give to all boys and girls a kind and an amount of preliminary training which will help prevent such backwardness may be a necessary form of insurance against future economic ills.

Within the last thirty years, the same developments in transportation which have fostered the nation's economic interdependence have made every man's individual doings his countrymen's concern to an extent undreamed of in the last century. The population of America no longer ebbs and flows merely by slow degrees; it can shift so far as its individual units are concerned, ceaselessly and with marked rapidity. Hence no group or section of the country is likely to remain long untouched by other groups. To insure that each individual receives such education as will make his part in society at least acceptable, and, better, positively helpful, will demand a degree and kind of education which far transcends that which can be offered merely at the elementary level.

Within this same period the control over young people exercised by the church and the home has grown notably less. Whatever the causes of this phenomenon, it has meant that important phases of education, once left confidently to the church and the home, are now in danger of being seriously neglected.

Within more than thirty years, but markedly within the last generation, changes have taken place in government which make it increasingly difficult for the citizen to play his part wisely in either local or national political life. The rapid growth in the complexity of social, economic, and industrial activities has been accompanied by a corresponding growth

in the complexity of the governmental machinery designed to regulate these activities. Merely to vote wisely at the present day—to say nothing of taking a more active part in political affairs—demands of each individual a knowledge of events and issues, of persons and forces, far beyond the knowledge which was once deemed adequate for reasonably competent citizenship.

These are by no means all the changes that have raised to prominence within the last generation the theory that the education provided for everyone should be extended to the secondary level. The present world-wide economic depression, for example, has not only brought into clear-cut focus many of these developments which have their roots deep in the past, but it has revealed to us, more urgently than ever before, still other reasons why adjustments in education must not be permitted to lag. It has emphasized the fact that no generation of mankind has yet thought through the problem of providing for the wants of all. Each man has been trained to provide for himself and for his family, hoping that out of such individualistic, uncoordinated efforts an effective economic system would emerge. It is now apparent that this way of approaching the work of the world is no longer adequate to maintain society at its present level of technological progress. Society is faced with imminent and catastrophic break-down unless great masses of people, not merely a few inspired leaders, learn to evaluate intelligently and to cooperate responsibly in a great variety of new plans for providing and sharing more good things than we have ever known how to provide or distribute.

It is also obvious that nothing in our family or industrial tradition is adequate to create the broad social and scientific point of view that the present emergency demands. Only education in and out of school, for children and for adults, can supply that new light and that new faith. If ever civilization was a race between education and catastrophe, it is so to-day. It is a small wonder that a wide-spread questioning of the adequacy of our present educational program has recently arisen, and that, in the minds of many observers, the provision at public expense of a program of secondary education for all has become within so short a time a matter of serious concern.

Recent Changes in the Practicability of Extended Education. Hand in hand with those increases in the complexity of

American life which seem to demand increased general education has come an increase in the possibility of financing a protracted education for young people. This latter change has been reflected in the tendency of boys and girls to stay longer and longer in school before attempting to take their places in the economic world—a tendency so marked that between 1900 and 1930 the average length of stay in school was extended by approximately three years.²⁰ Superficially, the change may be explained in terms of a steady growth in the “real” incomes of practically all classes of American workers, coupled with a strong faith on the part of Americans generally in the advantages of schooling. In the last thirty years practically every class of Americans has become “better off” financially than was the same class a generation ago, and practically every class has taken advantage of its gain to keep its children longer in school.

There is a more fundamental explanation of this change, however, than the mere fact of increased individual prosperity.²¹ The application of science to industry has made possible an enormously increased productivity on the part of the individual worker. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, one man's industry for a life-time produced little more in economic “goods” than the equivalent of his own material needs. If the members of his family were to be fed and clothed, they too had to become workers; so that pressure was inevitably put upon the young to go to work as soon as they could, and upon the old to stay at work as long as their advancing years permitted. Technological developments have radically changed these conditions. With the aid of machinery, one can now produce in a few years the economic equivalent of his own material needs for the whole span of his life. The further years that he may spend as a worker enable him either to add luxuries to his own necessities, or to support one or more other persons in economic idleness. The old need not work till the end of their days; in the form of savings or pensions or old-age insurance they can put aside from the results of their labor in the prime of life the equivalent of enough material goods to care for their needs when they are no longer working. And the young need not begin to work as soon as they are old enough to produce anything at all of economic

²⁰E. J. Kline: “Significant Changes in the Curve of Elimination Since 1900.” *Journal of Educational Research*, XXVI:608-16 (April, 1933).

²¹For an extended discussion of the fundamental factors involved in this change, see G. S. Counts: *Secondary Education and Industrialism*, pp. 16-46. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.

value; their material needs can be met from the increased productivity of adult workers.

These effects of the application of science to industry have been accentuated by the application of science to the prolongation of human life. That the span of human life has been steadily increasing is a matter of common knowledge. The economic results of this increase have been less generally recognized. The increase has meant, among other things, both a longer period during which the average adult can be economically productive, and a growing proportion of adults to children in the general population. It has thus still further increased the possibility of postponing the time at which young people need to begin to work in order to produce their share of economic goods.

Interpreted from the standpoint of increased economic productivity, the steadily lengthening period during which boys and girls have been staying in school has been largely a result of society's automatic adjustment to changed economic conditions. Not so much increased faith in schooling as decreased need for young people in industry, has been primarily responsible for the greater retention of young people in school.

The present economic crisis points to the imminence of further changes in the same direction. Many economists believe that the depression has resulted—in part, at least—from a combination of over-production and under-consumption. In so far as this is true, the depression has been brought about by the fact that more people have been producing material goods than are needed to produce all the goods that society can absorb under present methods of distribution. One cure for the depression, accordingly, must be sought, in the opinion of these economists, in a limitation of the number of workers engaged in materially productive enterprises. The necessary limitation has not been achieved by such increases in the length of preliminary schooling as have come about of their own accord; some further means must be adopted by which to keep young people out of productive employment. And one obvious means of doing so is to absorb the time of the young people by opening the secondary school freely to all—even, if necessary, by making secondary education compulsory.

The Resultant Conflict of Opinion. Out of the changes of both these sorts—changes in the apparent need for ex-

tended education on the part of everyone, and changes in the practicability of extended education—has grown the view that secondary education should be provided at public expense for all normal individuals.

The fact that this view meets with opposition is no doubt due in a measure to the failure of many people to recognize the changed conditions which support such a view. The recency and rapidity of these changes have undoubtedly helped to conceal their significance.

But the issue which now exists in the matter of free public secondary education is by no means a simple controversy between those who have "kept up with the times" and those who have not. Underlying the issue are the basic philosophical, psychological, and financial questions which have already been pointed out. Though the events of recent years suggest partial answers to these questions, historical events alone do not fully answer them. The question must be directly dealt with before the issue can be resolved.

III. UNIVERSAL SECONDARY EDUCATION AND THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAL

The first of the basic questions has to do with the appropriateness of free public secondary education under the American scheme of society. Assuming for the moment the practicability of a scheme of universal secondary education, so designed as to afford to each individual whatever teaching best meets his needs above the elementary level—is such a scheme consistent with what is commonly called "the American ideal," or necessary to the realization of that ideal?

Arguments for a Selective Secondary School. Those who argue on the negative side of the issue—that is to say, those who hold that secondary education should be definitely selective—seldom do so explicitly on the ground that the provision of free public education for all is incompatible with the theory of democracy. Their arguments are commonly based either on the contention that a large number of otherwise normal pupils are psychologically incapable of learning on the secondary-school level, or on the contention that financial considerations forbid a program of secondary education for all. The merit of these contentions must later be examined in detail; they directly involve the last two of the fundamental questions in terms of which the issue must be decided. But

since these contentions bear on the feasibility of a program of universal secondary education, rather than on the question of whether the effort to provide such a program represents a consistent part of the American scheme, they may be dismissed for the moment as not germane to the particular point under discussion.

More closely germane to that point is the argument that however desirable a program of universal secondary education may be in theory, the attempt to set up such a program is undesirable in practice. This argument is reflected in a number of the criticisms of secondary education cited earlier. It is explicitly presented by Martin: "The considerations which led our predecessors to attempt universal education and to-day justify the enormous expense of the enterprise are the commonplace of contemporary thought. . . Universal education at once asserts that equality of opportunity demanded by democracy and justifies the inequalities of competitive industrialism. All the arguments are in favor of the widest possible extension of education. But when we turn from argument to consideration of the actual situation, we may question whether in the attempt to educate everybody we are really educating anyone. There are almost insurmountable difficulties in trying to teach large numbers of students in crowded classrooms, where there is little opportunity for personal contact between the teacher and the individual student. Inevitably a vast educational system emerges which tends to become an end in itself and in which appear the tendencies to bureaucracy, the emphasis on externalities to the point of neglect of original aims and values, the standardization, uniformity, and spirit of quantity production which commonly defeat the ends of human organization."²²

The opposition to universal secondary education on philosophic grounds chiefly rests, in other words, not on the belief that an extended program of secondary education would be inappropriate if it could be effectively realized, but on the claim that many purely practical considerations make such a program impossible, if not actually undesirable. With these practical considerations in mind, the proponents of selection question whether it is advantageous even to attempt a marked extension of the present offering.

Defects in the Major Argument for Selection. It should be noted that the argument against universal secondary edu-

²²E. D. Martin: "Education." *Whither Mankind* (Charles A. Beard, editor), pp. 380-81. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928.

cation from this standpoint tends to gauge the eventual success of the contemplated program almost wholly in terms of the results of public secondary education thus far. Present results obviously furnish some measure of results to be expected—at least of results to be expected in the immediate future. When Martin refers to standardization, uniformity, and the spirit of quantity production as characteristics of the present educational system, and when other writers emphasize the decline of intellectual values or the fact that “a white-collared America has educated itself out of first-class mechanics and craftsmen,” the defects to which they point cannot be lightly ignored.

But the protagonists of an extended educational program may, and do, fairly decline to accept present trends as a conclusive answer to the question of what America should strive to accomplish in the future. The present system of secondary education is what it is partly because it is a comparatively planless system. Its undesirable standardization, its uniformity (which is unquestionably more apparent than actual), and its spirit of quantity production are largely the results either of traditional influences persisting from the day of very different educational aims and methods, or of unthinking imitation of business and industry. The paradox reflected in an apparent decline in intellectual values on the one hand, and in an undue fostering of “white-collared” ambitions on the other, is a paradox that has arisen because the school has allowed itself to take its immediate cues from every external demand. At no time in their history, thus far, have the secondary schools of the nation established a comprehensive program for themselves, based on systematic analysis of the needs of the society which they are intended to serve. To conclude that no better attack can be made on educational problems than that which is being made to-day is to dismiss without trial the possibility of a thoughtfully conceived and systematically organized educational program.

Arguments for an Extended Program of Secondary Education. Insisting on the need for farsighted planning of the educational program, those who favor universal secondary education advance two major arguments for an extension of the present program. The first of these arguments has already been suggested in the account of the development of the general issue of free public secondary education: *Present social conditions require a markedly extended educational program*

if the stability of American society is to be assured. The second argument relates not so much to mere present necessities as to abiding democratic ideals: American democracy demands for its fullest development the provision of equal educational opportunity, and such opportunity can hardly be afforded unless the secondary school is made open to all.

The strength of the first argument can hardly be denied. So long as the desirability of extended education, rather than its feasibility, is the point to be considered, the need for meeting the increasing complexity of society with increasing education is obvious. No one familiar with the details of recent social changes can be blind to their theoretical implications for secondary education. Other agencies than the school—in particular, the home and the church—must be counted on to assume their share of educational responsibility, and must be stimulated so far as possible to resume responsibilities which they are at present in danger of neglecting. But the new educational needs created by social change—the need for preliminary vocational training, for an extension of general education which will help to lessen the “backwardness” of certain sections of the country, for such general understanding of facts and issues as may be essential to competent leadership—these needs point directly and unequivocally to increased responsibilities on the part of the school. They provide abundant justification, indeed, not merely for an attempt to attract into the secondary school the pupils who now receive no high-school training, but for an effort to raise the general level of education, by compulsion if need be.²³

Nor can one deny the force of the argument as to the theoretical desirability of approaching so far as possible the ideal of equal educational opportunity. Clearly equality of opportunity must be granted as inherent in the democratic ideal. Clearly also, the realization of equal educational opportunity must involve the provision of secondary education for all who can reasonably be expected to profit by it.

But unfortunately the latter of these two arguments has often been debased by those who have sought to use it to win public support for even the present educational program. “Equality of educational opportunity” has frequently been reduced to a mere slogan, perhaps respected as an ideal but offering no dependable guidance in concrete practice. How-

²³It should again be emphasized that this argument is based on theoretical considerations alone. The desirability of increasing the age-level of compulsory attendance must be determined in large part by practical considerations, which will be examined later.

ever strong the theoretical argument for universal secondary education, that argument needs to be freed from the unfavorable connotations which have attached to the striving for equality of educational opportunity, before it is likely to be widely accepted.

The Demand for Equality of Educational Opportunity. As a slogan "equality of opportunity" has been pushed to extremes. At one extreme it has seemed to mean that every individual should be provided at public expense with whatever advantage might accrue, by whatever chance, to any other individual. Thus interpreted it has served as an excuse for unchecked and unguided extensions of the educational program, to include almost any type of service which anyone might conceivably demand. At the other extreme, it has meant a merely nebulous aspiration to make life easier and happier for numerous boys and girls whose lives have been none too easy and happy in the past. At each extreme the interpretation put upon the ideal has been open to such obvious criticisms as to throw suspicion not merely on equality of opportunity as a desirable goal, but on the need for further extension of the educational program.

Secondary Education and Minimum Desirable Individual Opportunities. The way in which the ideal may be soundly interpreted has recently been clearly illustrated. In an attempt to define the kind of society which America is seeking to achieve, a committee of the National Education Association has listed the major social-economic goals "most desirable for (and presumably . . . most desired by) the individual American."²⁴ Equality of opportunity represents one of these goals. The committee's introductory definition of this goal consists of a broad statement, so general as perhaps to permit of a variety of interpretations. "In the light of modern knowledge of individual differences," the committee says, "we do not construe [the equality of mankind] to mean equality of powers and abilities or of other innate or acquired personal traits. But equality as a social principle means equality of rights and opportunities, therefore no special privileges; it means the equal chance to attain to one's fullest possible development; it means accepting duties, responsibilities, and service in proportion to abilities; it means compensation in proportion to

²⁴Committee on the Social-Economic Goals of America (John Dewey, Willard E. Givens, Fred J. Kelly, Chairman, Leon C. Marshall, Robert C. Moore, Edward A. Ross): *The Social Economic Goals of America*, p. 1. Washington: National Education Association, 1933.

services rendered; and it means the general diffusion among the people of the knowledge, the ethics, the idealism, and the spirit which as nearly as possible shall make this equality actual and effective."²⁵ The committee's report makes a major contribution to educational thinking in that it does not leave the subject with this very general definition but seeks to describe the goal in practical terms. In so doing it provides a statement of certain of the *minimum desirable* opportunities which America must provide for its people before equality of opportunity can be realized. "Equality of opportunity," it concludes, "... should involve for each individual the opportunity to live a healthy, happy, satisfying life, to have a comfortable, sanitary home, to have useful employment that yields a comfortable living for self and dependents, to be surrounded by the beauty and truth that are inspiring and elevating rather than by the ugliness and deceptions that are discouraging and degrading, to enjoy the same rights under the law as are enjoyed by those more powerful or more favored by fortune, and to have the benefits of such educational facilities and other means of proper development as will enable the individual to become the happiest, most efficient, and most useful member of society possible with his natural endowments."²⁶

It is to some such statement as this, amplified and made more specific, that education must look for guidance if the ideal of equal educational opportunity is to be translated into practice. A carefully elaborated statement of this sort would take account, indeed, not merely of the theoretical ideal of equal opportunity but of the immediate practical necessities of an education designed to meet current social needs. Its list of minimum desirable opportunities would thus reflect both the major arguments for an extended educational program. Given such a list which could be generally agreed on, the question of whether universal public secondary education is a necessary part of the American scheme could be far more definitely answered than is now possible. The essential question would be, not whether secondary education has thus far "worked" (since its defects at present are in many respects due to the absence of systematic plans under which it could be expected to "work" effectively), but whether secondary education is necessary in the case of every boy and girl as a means

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 14.

²⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 14-15. For a similar statement see President Hoover's White House Conference on Child Health and Protection: *The Children's Charter*. Reprinted in the Journal of the National Education Association, XXI:159 (May, 1932).

of providing those minimum opportunities which American society ought to assure to all its members.

Universal Secondary Education in the Light of What Seem to be the Present Goals of America. Unfortunately, there exists at present no comprehensive statement of minimum desirable opportunities that has been widely enough accepted to be depended on as an educational criterion. In the absence of such a statement, the general statement provided by the Committee on Social-Economic Goals is probably as trustworthy a guide as any now available. The implications of this statement with respect to free public secondary education are clear.

First, the minimum desirable opportunities which the committee describes cannot be achieved in the case of any boy or girl without the opportunity to gain an education well above the elementary level. Lacking some such discovery and fostering of his special abilities as the secondary school seeks to provide, the individual can rarely hope to "live a healthy, happy, satisfying life" or to gain "useful employment that yields a comfortable living." The committee itself emphasizes this conclusion. "Education must be universal in its extent and application. . . We are . . . far short of meeting this requirement. Although the number of boys and girls who continue into high school and college has increased enormously in the last twenty years, the great majority still stops with the elementary grades or early years of the high school. When the complex, rapidly changing, and difficult conditions of modern life are viewed in the light of attainments that are possible only at ages as advanced as fourteen to eighteen years, it is evident we still fall short of an education that is truly universal in scope."²⁷

Second, the minimum desirable opportunities cannot be achieved by the same means for all. If each individual is to "become the happiest, most efficient, and most useful member of society possible with his natural endowments," both the nature and the extent of his education must be largely dictated by those endowments rather than by a uniform pattern applied to all individuals alike. This conclusion also is expressly stated by the committee. "Education must be universal in its materials and methods. Our schools must provide for all types of capacities in all their individual variations.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 19.

The tools and skills needed for abundant living must be multiplied far beyond the three R's that once sufficed."²⁸

The Responsibility of the Secondary School—It is obvious that public secondary education alone cannot fulfill the responsibilities which acceptance of these goals implies. Secondary education has been defined, for this discussion, as the education "provided *by schools* for the purpose of guiding and promoting the development of normal individuals." Schools are, and in the nature of things must continue to be, somewhat artificial institutions—artificial in the sense that they condense, select from, and otherwise modify the life-experiences to which boys or girls might normally be subject, in order to make the learning which should result from these experiences speedier and more effective. Often out-of-school experience may be of greater value than any reproduction or modification of such experience which the school can provide. Hence, while the school must undertake major responsibility for systematic education, it needs at the same time to be continually on its guard against assuming that it can or must do what may be better done by non-school agencies—the home, the church, the job, and even such agencies (loosely controlled from the educational standpoint) as the press, the theatre, and the radio. The school must clearly rely on other social institutions for a large share of the direct task of education, devoting its own efforts to insuring the greatest possible profit on the part of its pupils from the educational opportunities which these other institutions provide.

Yet with all the possibilities for education which are afforded by non-school agencies and by life itself, chief responsibility for the attainment of such educational goals as those which have been described must still rest with the public secondary school. That certain individuals have gained satisfying and useful places in American society without the advantages of formal secondary education, or with an education not specifically adapted to their needs, does not diminish this responsibility. The assumption that every individual should have opportunity to find such a place implies that society is under obligation to provide that opportunity by the surest means available—namely, a system of secondary schools as well as of elementary schools, responsive to the varied needs of pupils of various aptitudes and interests, and freely open to all to such an extent as to make possible the universal achieve-

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 19.

ment of the minimum desirable opportunities which a democracy should afford.

In the light of all these considerations there would seem to be good reason to assume, not merely that a system of universal free public secondary education is compatible with the American ideal, but that the support of such a system is essential to the full realization of that ideal. This assumption finds wholly sufficient justification in what is presumably a generally accepted thesis—that American society needs and seeks for all its members a reasonable modicum of health, happiness, and prosperity. Under present-day conditions that modicum can hardly be achieved, except by chance, without the provision of universal opportunities for secondary schooling.

IV. SECONDARY EDUCATION AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY TO LEARN

The second major question having direct bearing on the general issue concerns the possibility of devising a program of secondary education which will be of benefit to various types of pupils. Granted a definition of secondary education which conceives such education as adapted to the varied individual needs of a heterogeneous group of learners, granted the desirability of providing secondary education for all as a part of the American scheme, there still remains the question of whether the secondary school can in actual fact fulfill the demand that democracy makes on it. Are there not some pupils—even otherwise "normal" pupils—who are uneducable in the sense that the secondary school can do nothing which will be of value both for them and at the same time for society?

Psychological Theories With Respect to Capacity to Learn. No final answer to this question is yet possible. Though the question is essentially psychological in nature, educational psychologists are divided with respect to it. All psychologists recognize the existence of marked individual differences in the capacity to learn. A certain group of psychologists apparently hold, however, that major differences of this sort are themselves products of learning or lack of learning—that what has happened to an individual since his birth is of far greater weight than is the equipment with which the individual is born, in determining both his achieve-

ment and his capacity to achieve.²⁹ From the point of view of these psychologists, the fact that boys and girls of secondary-school age differ markedly in capacity is a product on the one hand of educators' present lack of understanding of the effects of environment, and on the other hand of educators' present inability or unwillingness to exercise sufficient control over children's environment to produce the effects desired. Bertrand Russell states this position explicitly: "If existing knowledge were used and tested methods applied, we could, in a generation, produce a population almost wholly free from disease, malevolence, and stupidity. We do not do so, because we prefer oppression and war."³⁰ Given more knowledge of how to teach than we now possess, and given freedom to use that knowledge, we should find, according to this view, that no normal pupils are uneducable.

An opposing group of psychologists hold that inherited traits are of such fundamental and lasting importance as to outweigh the utmost influence of environment.³¹ From this standpoint, individual differences in capacity must be recognized and built upon; they cannot be prevented or ever completely eradicated by education. Moreover, the nature of inherited abilities or disabilities may, in many respects, imply fixed limits beyond which the individual cannot go. Thus it is possible not merely that certain pupils cannot learn as rapidly as can other pupils, but that some pupils, handicapped by limitations which education cannot remove, cannot learn at all beyond more or less definite limits.³²

The Practical Effects of Schooling. Study of the practical effects of such schooling as we now know how to give throws no more conclusive light on the question than does psychological analysis. Much has been made in recent years of the results of investigations of success in out-of-school life compared with the number of years spent in school. The outcome of these investigations has generally been positive, particularly when "success" has been measured by money in-

²⁹For an illustration of an extreme position on this side of the question, see Chaps. I-III by J. B. Watson in *Psychologies of 1925*. Worcester: Clark University, 1926.

³⁰*Education and the Good Life*, p. 315. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.

³¹This position is variously illustrated in C. E. Spearman: *The Abilities of Man—Their Nature and Measurement* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927); L. M. Terman, editor: *Genetic Studies of Genius* (Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press, 1925, 1926, 1930); William MacDougall: *Is America Fit for Democracy?* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons 1921).

³²A summary of the psychological controversy as to the relative effects of heredity and environment in education, and a digest of objective data bearing on the controversy, may be found in the *Twenty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Nature and Nurture—Their Influence Upon Intelligence and Achievement*. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company, 1928.

come³³; from which enthusiasts for the public schools have frequently been led to conclude that the more schooling a boy or girl receives, the "better off" he is likely to be—the one condition causing the other. It is only necessary to point to the selective character of our present educational system to show the fallacy of this conclusion. The pupils who stay in school are in general pupils who are endowed with intellectual intelligence above the average, with more than ordinary financial resources, with somewhat exceptional home backgrounds, and with a rather marked degree of ambition.³⁴ These are highly advantageous characteristics outside the school as well as inside. Hence the fact that a boy or girl attains an eventual success in life proportionate to his length of stay in school does not necessarily mean that the schooling is directly responsible for the success. It may mean—and in many present cases it undoubtedly does mean—merely that the characteristics which made it possible for the boy or girl in question to survive in school were characteristics which make it possible for him to succeed in out-of-school life. As to whether the boys and girls who continued in school might not have been quite as successful if they had left school earlier, we have no sure knowledge. Still less have we any certain knowledge as to whether the boys and girls who dropped out of school would have been more successful if they had continued.

Need for Empirical Determination of Individual Capacity.

In the face of contradictory evidence from psychological sources, and of lack of thoroughly dependable evidence from the work of the schools themselves, the question of whether the secondary school can provide education of value to all normal pupils must be answered for the most part empirically. The existence of some individual differences in ability to learn, which education cannot now overcome, may be taken for granted. Experience makes it apparent that different types of formal education—different in methods, in materials, and in outcomes—are appropriate and necessary to pupils of differing abilities. Experience also makes it apparent that in the case of any single individual diminishing returns occur after the individual's formal education has progressed for a certain length of time. Experience finally makes it apparent that in the case of different individuals the diminishing re-

³³See, however, H. F. Clark: "Economic Effects of Education." *Journal of Higher Education* 1, 3:141-48 (March, 1930). Clark's investigations seem to show that "the longer one goes to school above a certain minimum, the less is his income" (p. 145).

³⁴See the studies by Counts, and by Kefauver, Noll and Drake already referred to.

turns tend to set in after differing lengths of formal schooling. The need for different types of education by different individuals, the occurrence of gradually diminishing educational returns in the case of any single individual, and the onset of diminishing returns at different points for different individuals—these are phenomena which may or may not be inherent in the nature of learning, but which are obvious and inescapable at the present stage of practical knowledge of how to teach.

The question of whether certain normal pupils are incapable of profiting by secondary education must be answered chiefly in terms of the last of these phenomena. That different types of education are needed by different pupils is widely recognized in practice as well as in theory. Progressive secondary schools have already gone far toward meeting that need, both by the offering of a wide variety of curricula—academic, semi-professional, technical, commercial, industrial, agricultural, artistic, and the like—and by the provision of differentiated methods of teaching within these curricula. The occurrence of diminishing educational returns is recognized in the educational system as a whole, by the provision of curricula of various lengths, depending on the nature and complexity of the goals sought. Notwithstanding these arrangements, does the factor of diminishing educational returns operate to make secondary education valueless for any considerable number of pupils? Are there, in other words, normal pupils who cannot profit by any of the opportunities that secondary schools are able to offer?

Present Limitations of Secondary Education. It needs hardly more than a cursory examination of the work of the pupils enrolled in almost any large high school to show that there are pupils who *are not now* profiting in any appreciable measure by the education which the school is providing for them. These pupils tend to fall into two major groups. There are, first, certain boys and girls who are willing to learn and who are apparently making every effort to do so, but who have come to a point beyond which they find it impossible to advance. Schools sometimes overlook the presence of such pupils because promotions are often granted them on the basis of effort alone, irrespective of accomplishment; but the records of continued lack of progress in school work, presented, for example, by such investigations as that now being conducted under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation in

Pennsylvania,³⁵ make it obvious that the pupils are there nevertheless. Second, there are boys and girls who may be able to learn, but who are so lacking in a sense of responsibility for their own education that they make practically no effort to profit by their school work. The prevailing notion that any individual possesses the "right" to as long a period of schooling as he or his parents may wish has much to answer for in this connection. This notion would seem to be largely responsible for the retention by certain schools of boys whose only evident contribution to their own good or that of the school comes through their prowess in athletics; of girls whose sole obvious gain from school membership lies in the social prestige which they are able to enjoy by being high-school pupils; and of boys and girls both who profit chiefly not from anything they learn in school, but merely from being kept off the street. These two groups together—the pupils who would learn if they could, but who apparently cannot, and the pupils who make no apparent effort to learn, irrespective of their ability—tend to constitute only a small proportion of the total membership of any single school. In terms of all the secondary schools in the nation, however, their numbers almost certainly run to tens or even hundreds of thousands. And whether their numbers in any single school are large or small, they represent for every school in the land a positive challenge to the theory that secondary education should be freely open to all.

It will be objected, of course, that the mere fact that these pupils are not learning constitutes no proof that they could not learn with proper teaching. It is true that if we knew more about how to teach than we do actually know, or if our teaching staffs were composed of none but the most able of teachers, or if our curriculum could be better adapted than most schools now know how to adapt it to pupils' needs, or if our schools could control pupils' out-of-school environment as they cannot now possibly control it—if such conditions as these could be met, the membership of both groups of failing pupils might be reduced practically to zero. It is true also that progressive secondary schools have made numerous recent advances in their efforts to deal successfully with failing pupils in nearly all the respects just suggested. Unquestionably much more could be done to lessen the number

³⁵Study of the Relations of Secondary and Higher Education in Pennsylvania by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in cooperation with the Joint Commission of the Association of Pennsylvania College Presidents and the State Department of Public Instruction. For an account of the nature of this investigation and of its results thus far, see the various *Progress Reports* issued by the Carnegie Foundation.

of failures in the average school, were the average school to take advantage of the successful procedures which the better schools have evolved. But the fact remains that even in the best of our schools we cannot now completely prevent these failures. And so long as the failures are there, any rational attempt to set up a program of practical action must take them into account.

It may also be objected that success in school work has here been too narrowly interpreted. There are those who argue that desirable social habits and attitudes may result from school membership, irrespective of pupils' achievement in formal school subject matter. No doubt this is to some extent true. But present knowledge of the genesis and development of habits and attitudes, limited though such knowledge is, would suggest that for the two groups of pupils in question this result is not likely to follow. One cannot become possessed of habits and attitudes in a vacuum; they must attach to the activities in which one is chiefly engaged, and must inevitably be colored by one's success in those activities. Continued failure by high-school pupils in school activities of supposedly demonstrable value is hardly conducive to the development of habits or attitudes of positive social worth. Long-continued failure would seem calculated, indeed, to produce the very opposite of desirable characteristics in the individual who fails. Nor will an attempt by the school to make the pupil think he has succeeded, when by any disinterested standard he has failed, do much to remedy matters. At best it can only postpone the day when he learns the truth, harshly and with no one to counsel or help him, from life outside the school.

Impossibility of Immediate Attainment of the Ideal. In terms of the general question of whether the secondary school can actually accomplish the task which the American ideal sets for it, these various considerations may be summarized as follows: Psychological evidence does not show conclusively whether all boys and girls can in actual fact be so educated as to provide for them even the minimum desirable advantages which America is seeking. Through experimentation with new methods and materials of teaching, American schools have been making important gains in their ability to provide these advantages for an increasingly larger proportion of the population. There is every reason to believe that with further experimentation the gains may be continued,

and there is reason to urge upon all schools the adoption of procedures which hold forth promise in this direction. In present practice, nevertheless, schools in general are finding themselves unable to deal successfully from a strictly educational standpoint with certain boys and girls who should presumably be profiting by secondary education. Thus, however desirable a program of universal secondary education may be from an idealistic point of view, it is apparent that such a program cannot be completely realized at the present stage of educational knowledge.

The practical implications of this conclusion need careful examination. In particular, the question of what is to be done in the case of those boys and girls for whom the secondary school cannot fulfill its proper function demands attention. This question can be most appropriately dealt with, however, as a major issue in itself rather than as a question subordinate to the issue of free public secondary education; so that no further treatment of it is here attempted.³⁶

But the existence of serious limitations on our present educational knowledge and skill holds one important implication which may well be set down at this point. That implication concerns the desirability of raising the age-level of compulsory attendance as a means of extending the program of secondary education. The urgency of the need for universal secondary education would suggest, from a theoretical standpoint, the use of legal compulsion to draw pupils into the secondary school and to hold them there. Practically, such compulsion would inevitably result under present conditions in mere time-serving on the part of many of the pupils who would be added to the secondary-school enrollment. Not until a program has been evolved which offers greater assurance of educational value to all pupils than does the existing program, can the age-limit under which pupils are compelled to attend schools of the usual type be justifiably raised much above its present level.

If other criteria than chronological age were to be substituted for the present age-level, greater justification might perhaps be found for compulsion. Forces outside the school are, however, already working to produce a steadily increasing length of stay in school. In particular, the growing

³⁶For a detailed discussion of this question see Issue II: Shall secondary education seek to retain all pupils in school as long as they wish to remain, or shall it transfer them to other agencies under educational supervision when, in the judgment of the school authorities these agencies promise to serve better the pupils' immediate and probable future needs?

economic productivity commented on in an earlier part of this discussion can be counted on to exercise very definite influence in this direction. To add the effect of legal compulsion to such influences as this would seem, under present conditions, to impose demands on secondary education which most secondary schools are quite unprepared to meet. Until secondary schools in general have been able to develop more effective procedures than those which they now employ, and until events have proved that forces outside the school will not of themselves provide an adequate incentive to increased school attendance, the further compulsion of formal secondary education is likely to be both impractical and undesirable.

V. AMERICA'S ABILITY TO PAY FOR AN EXTENDED PROGRAM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

The final question concerns the financial practicability of supporting an extended program of secondary education. As has been shown, present limitations on educational knowledge and skill offer barriers to the full achievement of the ideal program. There are undoubtedly, nevertheless, many thousands of boys and girls not now receiving the advantages of secondary education who can profit to an important degree by what the secondary school knows how to provide; and there are countless schools whose educational programs can be greatly increased in value, if these schools are given financial support which will allow them to adopt the best educational procedures now available. Assuming adequate support, the ideal program can thus be much more nearly approximated than is now the case. Can this support be provided? Can the public afford to pay, and ought it to be expected to pay, for a system of secondary schools offering the most effective type of education which we now know how to give, freely open to all pupils who can be expected to profit from such education?

The Scope of the Present Discussion. The principle that such secondary schools as the public may support should be free and not tuition schools has been well enough established to need no elaboration here. It should be pointed out, however, that a considerable extension of this principle will be necessary before there can be any close approximation to the ideal program of secondary education. The absence of tui-

tion-fees does not of itself make education free of expense to the pupil; the cost of going to and from school when the school is at a distance from pupils' homes, the cost of food and adequate clothing, and the loss of income in the case of pupils who might be earning if they were not in school, all represent charges which at present weigh on many families so heavily as to prevent continued education in the case of boys and girls who might well profit by it. Thorough-going acceptance of the ideal of free public secondary education must eventually require direct attention to all these matters, through more adequate provision than is now often available for the transportation of pupils, through the furnishing of suitable food, clothing, and medical attention for needy pupils, and through the subsidizing of indigent families to offset the loss of income involved in maintaining a son or a daughter in school.

But the extension of the principle of free public secondary education to include public responsibility for such expenses as these involves questions of social service and relief rather than of education as such. For this reason expenses of the sort described are not directly considered in the present discussion. The question with which this discussion is directly concerned is that of the financial possibility of providing secondary education at public expense for all pupils who can now avail themselves of it, or who could avail themselves of it were their financial circumstances favorable to their remaining in school.

Secondary Education and the Depression. On the answer to this question the events of the current economic depression have obvious bearing. The depression has in many communities brought about a marked narrowing of the scope of the educational program. Cities burdened with bond issues for school buildings erected in more prosperous times have been obliged not merely to default their obligations, but to go without pressingly needed new construction. Towns whose physical equipment is adequate have found it necessary to reduce their teaching staffs below the numbers which would ordinarily be considered essential, and to lower the salaries of the teachers retained. School systems almost everywhere have been forced to curtail or to eliminate altogether types of educational service previously accepted as parts of the established offering; and whole states, as well as individual communities, have been faced with the prospect of having

to close their schools completely. As the depression has continued the suspicion has become widespread that an educational program which seemed wholly feasible five years ago may in fact be unachievable because of its cost.

To point out that present conditions are undoubtedly temporary detracts little from the significance of this situation. Though fair days may come again, less prosperous times too are likely to reappear; and any practicable educational program must reckon with the low points in economic conditions as well as with the high.

Nor can the present situation be dismissed by the bare statement, often repeated before the depression, that since Americans pay less for their schools each year than they pay for cosmetics or tobacco or candy, they can obviously afford a far more costly educational program than they are now supporting. The total expenditure for American public elementary and secondary schools amounted, in 1930, to less than 3 percent of the national income—only one-fifth as much as was lavished on passenger automobiles.³⁷ There is unquestionably enough spending-money in the country to cover the schools' budgets. The problem of financing the schools is, however, not a problem merely of proving that there is money available for their maintenance; it is a problem also of devising a system of school support that will be just, thoroughly effective and economical, and so administered as to win wholehearted public approval. Hence the experience of schools in the depression must be reckoned with in any attempt to determine whether an extended program of secondary education is a feasible program.

Major Defects in the Present System of School Support. The depression has clearly shown that current methods for levying taxes for the support of the schools cannot be depended on as the basis for a long-time program.³⁸ Taxes on real estate, on which the schools now chiefly depend, bear exceedingly inequitably on the various groups on whom they are levied. Under the present system of small tax areas, each of which is primarily dependent on its own resources for the support of its schools, the highest possible taxes are in many cases quite inadequate for the maintenance of

³⁷From data presented in *Facts on School Costs*, pp. 206, 219. Research Bulletin of the National Education Association Vol. X No. 5 (November, 1932).

³⁸For a comprehensive discussion of the defects of present systems of school support, see H. C. Morrison: *School Revenue and The Management of the School Money*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930, 1932. For an analysis of such defects as they have been apparent especially in the current depression see Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education: *Report of the National Conference on Financing of Education*. Washington: National Education Association, 1933.

even a passable school system. The public is becoming increasingly conscious of these conditions, to such an extent that in numerous communities there is widespread condemnation not so much of taxes as of the existing system of taxation. With justice, effectiveness, and public approval all lacking, it would be difficult to argue that the present tax system furnishes an adequate basis even for maintaining the existing program of secondary education, much less for extending that program.

Defects in the General Allotment of School Funds. The depression has also made it clear that current methods of spending the school money need revision if a comprehensive program of secondary education is to be put into effect. The most serious defects in the present scheme of school expenditures are probably those growing out of the small-district system under which schools are now generally administered.³⁹ Under this system hundreds of separate communities within each state (a few states excepted) administer their schools more or less independently of each other. That such a scheme must frequently result in costly duplication of service and equipment is obvious. Wealthy districts, moreover, finding it easy to raise liberal sums for their schools, are often tempted to spend money extravagantly on educational undertakings; while adjacent poorer districts may be supporting school systems which are uneconomical because of their very meagerness. The small-district system would probably be unduly expensive even if the districts involved had been carefully and systematically established. The almost complete planlessness of the existing system augments its disadvantages to such an extent as effectively to block attempts at any widespread expansion of the educational program.⁴⁰

Defects in the Financial Administration of Individual School Systems. The depression makes it clear, finally, that internal reforms are necessary in the financial administration of individual school systems. For the more obvious forms of extravagance from which numerous schools are now suffer-

³⁹Cf. A. C. Morrison, *op. cit.*, and F. Engelhardt, W. H. Zeigel, Jr., W. M. Proctor, and S. S. Mayo: *District Organization and Secondary Education*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 8, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

⁴⁰Cf. F. Engelhardt, W. H. Zeigel, Jr., W. M. Proctor, and S. S. Mayo: *District Organization and Secondary Education* (National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 8, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17), p. 81: "The most outstanding limitation to school-district organization as it exists in most States to-day is the apparent lack of planning. Few states appear to have any plan other than that which arises out of the current demand for fiscal relief. This policy may be questioned on the ground that if public schools are to be efficiently and economically maintained, then the organizational machinery erected to provide educational services must be constantly studied and reviewed in order that the organization may be re-adapted to provide improved services at greater returns per dollar expended."

ing, as evidenced in the provision of unnecessarily elaborate school buildings and equipment, school officials are probably no more to blame than is the general public. School people and public alike were unquestionably affected by the tendency to open-handed spending on material things which preceded the depression. But wherever the fault may lie, school systems have obviously been administered thus far with almost complete disregard for the long-time effect of capital expenditures. In many instances the consequence is a burden of debt which may prevent marked educational advance for years.

Internal administrative policy has been strikingly deficient in other respects as well. As current efforts at retrenchment have shown, the scheduling of classes, the organization of the program of studies, the assignment of teaching duties, the use of buildings and equipment, all have been conducted in many school systems without adequate scrutiny of the relationship between cost and educational return. More important than the common laxity in these details, however, is the fact that school authorities have seriously neglected the establishment of public understanding and support for their fiscal policies in general. The ruthless abandonment by many communities of instruction in certain subjects, under the misconception that money can be saved merely by forcing pupils to study one subject rather than another, clearly illustrates the results of this neglect. The blind elimination of expenditures for textbooks—relatively small expenditures in any school budget, and expenditures from which the educational returns are unquestionably high—furnishes a further illustration. Laxity in administrative detail has no doubt already been corrected in most systems, as a result of sheer financial necessity. But the public suspicion aroused by the revelation of this laxity, and the absence of public appreciation of what the school money goes to buy, represent factors that must inevitably stand in the way of any immediate growth in the educational program.

Needed Reforms in Present Methods of Raising and Administering School Funds. Can the public justly be expected to pay for an extended program of secondary education under such conditions as these? The answer must clearly be no. Reform is essential in practically every major phase of the financial administration of the schools if a program even approaching the ideal is to be realized. The details of that reform can be worked out only through a long period of experi-

mentation, and must no doubt vary from one section of the country to another. Moreover, the needed reform is not limited to a revision in the methods of school support alone; it represents only a single phase of a whole system of urgently required tax revision. So far as the schools themselves are concerned, however, the general outlines of what must be done are clearly apparent even now.

There must be, first, a revision of the tax basis for the support of the schools, to provide for a distribution of support over larger and (from the standpoint of taxable resources) more nearly equivalent areas, and to allow support to be derived from a source more just than levies based principally on real estate. Without some such revision the present inequalities in educational achievement seem bound to persist.

There must be, second, a revision of the small-district system to permit the maximum economy of administration consistent with a continuance of local interest in the schools. Possibly this revision should look toward a reorganization of school districts coupled with the assumption of primary responsibility for school support and control by the State, as in Delaware and North Carolina. Or perhaps the necessary reform may be accomplished through extensive redistricting within the States, together with some such plan for the equalization of local financial burdens as that which has been adopted in New York State. Whether it comes through one of these plans or through some scheme as yet untried, systematic reform of the present school-district system is obviously necessary before any widespread advance in secondary education can be achieved.

There must be, third, an extensive reform in methods of internal financial administration. The need for long-term planning of capital expenditures and general financial commitments is obvious. The details of year-by-year educational expenses, moreover, must be continually scrutinized to prevent extravagance and waste. Above all, such accountings must periodically be rendered as will show in clear and convincing fashion just what the school money has been spent for, and how far the returns have justified the expense. Lacking this final reform particularly, the public can hardly be expected to pay for an extended educational program, whatever the public's ability to pay may be.

Is an Extended Program of Secondary Education Financially Practicable? If the needed reforms are accomplished,

can the nation then afford an approach to the ideal program of secondary education? Though the question can be answered at present only in terms of conjecture, there is reason to believe that it can fairly be answered in the affirmative. That the national income is ample to cover the cost of a greatly extended educational program seems evident from the facts already cited with respect to school expenditures. Two further facts stand out prominently in support of the assumption that a program of nearly universal secondary education may eventually be entirely practicable from the financial standpoint.

First, each major extension of secondary education to a larger proportion of the population serves in itself to increase in the long run the nation's ability to support its schools. Indefinitely prolonged schooling on the part of individuals who have already had at least the minimum essentials may be of questionable worth. But the provision of education for persons who would otherwise lack the essentials may be expected—at least under an economic system not radically different from that now in existence—to produce returns of tangible value. This is no mere theoretical statement; it is based on careful observation of what actually has happened in recent educational history.⁴¹

Financial returns from public education are long-deferred and to some extent unmeasurable.⁴² The returns are nevertheless real enough and large enough to be reckoned with in estimating society's capacity to pay for more schooling. They are observable already in objective comparisons of the present wealth of states which invested heavily in public education a generation or more ago, with the wealth of states, otherwise in equivalent circumstances, which undertook less extensive educational programs.⁴³ The results of public education are by no means limited, moreover, to lessened need for the support of penal and protective institutions—the form in which the public most often has been led to picture them.⁴⁴ They show themselves even more clearly in the form of higher standards of living, greater and more widespread capacity to achieve those stands, and correspondingly greater capacity to

⁴¹Cf. Vernon Bowyer: "Relation of Public-School Support to Subsequent Per-Capita Wealth of States." *Elementary School Journal*, XXXIII, 5, 6:333-45, 417-26 (January, February, 1933).

⁴²For an analysis of the nature of such returns see H. C. Morrison: *The Management of the School Money*, Chap. III. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

⁴³Vernon Bowyer, *op. cit.*

⁴⁴For recent evidence on the relationship between lack of schooling and delinquency, see George E. Hill: "Educational Attainments of Young Male Offenders." *Elementary School Journal*, XXXVI, 55, 53-58 (September, 1935).

purchase more education. Revision of the present inchoate system of school finance should in itself make possible an extension of the educational program. If to the increased economy produced by financial reform is added the greater capacity to pay made possible through extended educational opportunities, the ideal of universal secondary education would seem by no means unapproachable.

Second, present economic developments foreshadow a situation in which the nation will shortly have to consider whether it can afford *not* to provide practically universal secondary education. The abolition of child labor and the raising of the minimum age at which boys and girls may be gainfully employed are inherent parts of the national recovery program. More than that, they are apparently necessary parts of any program which seeks intelligent adjustment to the conditions brought about by recent technological advances. As a result, the unemployment of youth bids fair to be not just a temporary circumstance attendant on the depression, but a permanent characteristic of American society. For the hundreds of boys and girls who can no longer find useful occupation outside the school, the nation must make some sort of provision. At the least it must afford sufficient guidance and protection to these boys and girls to keep them from becoming drags on society; and it can hardly deny to those who are capable of continued educational progress the chance to make the most of their abilities through further work in school.

Present conditions and the recovery measures thus far adopted have already made acute the problem of providing for large numbers of these idle youth. For most of the boys and girls who are now unemployed, the most profitable course is clearly to continue their education. Unless the schools establish some arbitrary system of selection, the majority of these young people will seek to remain in school or to return to school, irrespective of any pressure which may or may not be brought to bear through compulsory-attendance laws. No arbitrary system of selection is conceivable which would permanently answer the needs of this situation. Moreover, it is doubtful that any such system could be devised which would meet with enough general approval to allow it to be permanently enforced; nor could the schools set up any such system and still be true to the part which they must presumably play in the democratic scheme. Through its efforts toward economic recovery the nation is thus already committing itself to one or the other of two possible courses. Either it must look

forward without conscious plan or purpose to a situation which, failing suitable provisions for dealing with the attendant problems, will be hopelessly mischievous and intolerable; or it must undertake the only apparent remedy for that situation—a greatly extended educational program.

In sum, therefore, the question of whether the nation can afford to provide an extended program of secondary education must be answered substantially as follows: Under current methods of obtaining support for schools and spending money for schools, there is reason to doubt the possibility of any marked permanent expansion of the present program. The methods of school support can, however, be revised and greatly improved upon. That they should be revised is clear, if only because of the urgent need of expansion in the educational program. Present social conditions make such expansion imperative, not despite its cost, but because whatever it may cost represents a necessary part of the price of economic and social recovery—a part of that price which the nation may reasonably expect to receive back again eventually in the tangible returns from education itself.

The Responsibility of School Officials in the Present Crisis. The needed extension of the educational program can come only through the efforts of educators themselves. For educators to rely on politicians in this crisis is to admit incompetence and to invite defeat. Many times in the past school officials have presented an extended program of secondary education to committees of the legislature under unfavorable and often definitely hostile conditions. The results have been uniformly the same—"report received and filed". The program was in conflict with other interests of the politicians. There was no clear mandate from the people that a program of extension was needed. Until such a mandate is registered those most concerned with education can expect little or nothing from legislatures.

Here then is the challenge to educators—to take this program to the people and convince them of the necessity for it. Educators with a sound philosophy, a clear vision of the place of education in society, and a workable program will find that the people of this country are interested and receptive. Too often in the past educators have disregarded a fundamental principle of democratic theory, namely, that institutional development cannot precede mass conviction. The experience of the trying years through which the nation has come should

convince those in charge of the schools of their error. As a group they have tended to ignore and to distrust their constituency. If American educators believe in democracy, if they believe in an extended secondary-school system, if they believe that education can be a vital force in the improvement of society, then they must be consistent with their faith. They must present to the people the reasons for the extension which is needed, the philosophy behind it, the method of financing it, and through the conviction which their program carries bring that program to success.

VI. A PRACTICABLE PROGRAM LOOKING TOWARD UNIVERSAL SECONDARY EDUCATION

The foregoing discussion has sought to clarify the major assumption on which any rational policy with respect to the place of public secondary education in America must rest. It is obvious that the assumptions that seem most defensible do not all point in the same direction. Ideally, the realization of American democracy would seem to call for a comprehensive program of secondary schools, supported at public expense and open to all normal individuals. Practically, such a system is at present unattainable. Its development is blocked in part by at least temporary limitations on what the secondary school can do for certain types of pupils. Its development is blocked also by the inadequacy of current methods of financial administration. Assuming that these obstacles are to be neither ignored nor unduly minimized, what is the soundest immediate program for American secondary schools?

The Need for an Educational Program of Convincing Value to the Public. Whatever program is adopted ought, it is clear, to preserve so far as possible all the advances already made in the direction of a program of universal secondary education, while at the same time it provides a sound basis for continued advances. Consideration of the financial situation of secondary schools in the depression makes it apparent that the program on which many schools have been working does not offer this sound basis for progress. The weakest aspect of the present program would seem to be its lack of convincing value to the general public. Such criticisms of the schools by laymen as those cited earlier in this discussion, as well as the frequent failure of the public to stand behind the schools in the depression, furnish ample evidence of this weak-

ness. Unless there be developed a program of convincing worth for all kinds of young men and women and unless such a program be widely explained and justified, criticisms are likely to increase as admission to the schools is granted to the large number of youth not now enrolled and for whom nothing else is open.

The fact that the present program has not gained thorough-going support has doubtless been due to a number of causes. In numerous individual instances the plans adopted may not have been altogether defensible. The policy of immediate expediency has so strongly colored educational undertakings in the past that it has often been difficult to justify such undertakings by logical deduction from a consistent philosophy of education. In most instances, however, the fault has doubtless lain not so much in the defenselessness of the measures which have been put into effect, as in the failure of school people to undertake any complete justification of these measures to the public. This would seem to have been especially the case with respect to the addition of new subject-matter to the high-school program. The public has not of itself "kept up with the times" concerning the basic social changes which have made these additions necessary, and school people, finding themselves able to expand their program even without specific public understanding, have failed to take steps which would insure such understanding.

The need for enlisting public understanding and support *in advance* of new undertakings cannot be too strongly emphasized. The depression has clearly shown that the public must be enlightened concerning many matters, both financial and educational, if even the present educational program is to be maintained without impairment. The extension of that program will hardly be possible without preliminary justification, fully understandable and acceptable to those who must provide financial support for the educational enterprise. In connection with each of the definite measures which are shortly to be suggested, therefore, it is to be understood that school officials must recognize an obligation to secure from the beginning the fullest possible public approval.

The Need for a Two-Fold Program. Whatever program is adopted must be of necessity, furthermore, a two-fold program. One part should comprise those things which the individual school can do more or less independently to achieve all possible progress under existing conditions. There is much

that individual schools can accomplish which many schools do not now even attempt, to bring about a closer approach to the ideal program in their own communities. The success of this part of the program must inevitably depend primarily on the knowledge and skill—and perhaps even more on the sense of responsibility and effort—of the individual administrator.

The other part should consist of reforms which call for united action by school people in general. Without joint action improvement in present conditions can be only halting and sporadic. To a degree the individual school will be limited in its progress except as all secondary schools make their programs sounder and more comprehensive. To an even greater degree the development of a truly national program of secondary education will be impossible without the active coöperation of those who are in immediate charge of secondary schools. Scarcely less than the first part of the program, therefore, the second part will depend for its success on the extent to which individual administrators make it their especial concern.

The specific measures which both individual schools and school people in general can now undertake, looking toward the fullest possible achievement of the ideal of universal secondary education, are as follows:

A Program for the Individual School. The individual secondary school should endeavor:

1. *To admit as pupils all boys and girls regularly promoted from the elementary school, and in addition such boys and girls as may not have completed the elementary-school program but seem likely to profit more largely from secondary-school work than from a continuance of work in the elementary school.* If the secondary school is to make even a beginning on the provision of universal secondary education, it cannot fail to recognize its obligation to give to every normal pupil a chance to undertake secondary-school work. The need for maintaining sound standards of accomplishment in the elementary grades, and for an appropriate division of functions between the elementary school and the secondary school, will mean that pupils will enter the secondary school at various ages. In a well conducted school system the number of pupils admitted to the secondary school without having completed the elementary-school program should be relatively small. There should, moreover, be close coöperation between the elementary school and the secondary school in providing for the

educational needs of such pupils. The elementary school should be prepared to define as accurately as possible the deficiencies of boys and girls who are promoted under this policy; the secondary school, in addition to offering new types of work to these pupils, should make immediate provision for such remedial instruction as may be required to remove their deficiencies. But no formal standards or division of functions should be so rigidly adhered to as either to force or to permit any normal pupil to leave school before he has had opportunity to receive at least some of that type of education which the secondary school should offer and which the elementary school does not offer.

2. *To admit as pupils also all boys and girls, and all men and women, who, having for any reason left school earlier, apply for readmission, and for whom further secondary education at public expense seems likely to be of both individual and social benefit.* The need for secondary education is not limited to those pupils who have been promoted in regular course from the elementary school. Boys and girls who have left school before they were adequately prepared to find a place in the economic world must still be the concern of the secondary school if it is to approach any complete fulfillment of its educational function. Men and women who may have established themselves successfully from the economic standpoint, but who seek either to prepare for occupations more fully in accord with their capacities or to supply their lack of broad general education, are likewise the school's concern. The secondary school has no inconsiderable part to play in the rapidly developing program of adult education; indeed, most adult education is and will continue to be secondary education, under the definition of secondary education used in this discussion. The further schooling of mature men and women will need to be organized and conducted separately from that of immature boys and girls. For adults and adolescents both, however, the secondary school should eventually make definite provision. If to do so immediately means jeopardizing the interests of those boys and girls who have been progressing regularly through school, the interests of the latter should first be respected. Under such circumstances only those persons should be readmitted whose needs can be adequately met through the regularly organized program. But the school should look forward to an extension of its educational service as rapidly as possible to all to whom further secondary edu-

cation will be individually and at the same time socially profitable.

3. *To incorporate in its offerings as many types of educational activity as may seem needed to meet the varied legitimate interests and abilities of its pupils.* The secondary school must determine its aims in the light of the educational needs of pupils who have profited as fully as they can profit from the work of the elementary school. It cannot justly determine its aims in the light of values which may or may not be inherent in an arbitrarily selected body of subject-matter. Hence its educational activities must differ as widely as the individual needs and abilities of its pupils differ. Both subject-matter and teaching method will need to be adapted not merely to the requirements of groups of pupils having certain major interests and abilities in common, but to the needs of individual pupils insofar as their legitimate interests depart from those of the general groups. Few except large schools will be able to provide all the differentiations which may be appropriate. Most schools, however, will be able to find in the programs of the more progressive schools numerous features which may to advantage be incorporated in their own programs, and which can readily be so incorporated. Where selection of activities is imperative, those activities should first be provided which promise greatest social return in proportion to the expense involved. The relative number of pupils who may be expected to profit from any given activity may be one criterion for selection; but activities which are merely desirable for many pupils should not be allowed to displace activities which are essential even for a few.

4. *To experiment as fully as its resources permit with new means of meeting the needs of pupils not adequately served by its present offerings or its present methods and materials of teaching; and to incorporate in its program whatever elements seem, as a result of this experimentation, to promise a social return proportionate to the expense involved.* Experiments based on no carefully thought out educational hypothesis, and experiments unchecked by careful observation, measurement, and evaluation of results, need to be strictly avoided. The great majority of secondary schools have been content to follow merely traditional patterns. Since even the best present secondary schools have found themselves unable to deal successfully with all the supposedly normal pupils whose needs they have sought to meet, the necessity for devising new edu-

cational methods and materials is urgent if the ideal program of secondary education is to be approached. Careful experimentation within every school in one clearly defined sector of its program would go far not merely toward adding to present knowledge of promising methods and materials, but toward making each school alert to opportunities for progressive improvement.

5. *To canvass thoroughly the out-of-school educational opportunities, both formal and informal, which are or may be made accessible to its pupils, and to see that its pupils gain the fullest possible advantage from these opportunities.* The secondary school tends all too often to regard itself as the sole source of effective education for boys and girls of high-school age. Hence it falls into the error of assuming that whatever education is provided for young people must be provided for them in school. The main current of systematic education must, it is true, be supplied by the school. Yet boys and girls are constantly subject to thoroughly educative experiences outside of school, which the school needs to take cognizance of and utilize, rather than to duplicate or supplant. In the development of every boy and girl, moreover, there comes eventually a time—and for some this time seems to come within the secondary-school period—when immersion in life outside of school holds more of value from the educational standpoint than does a continuance of the necessarily artificial environment supplied by the school. In view of all of these considerations, the secondary school needs to enumerate for itself as definitely as possible the tangible educational possibilities offered by the non-school agencies or activities with which its pupils may come or may be brought into contact—by homes, churches, libraries, museums, Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., Boy and Girl Scouts, vocational employment of various sorts (both paid and unpaid), the Civilian Conservation Corps, newspapers, magazines, theatres, concerts, radio, public meetings, and any and every other type of institution or activity which may either supplement or perhaps desirably supplant the work that the school itself provides. The school needs, further, to make such use of out-of-school experiences as may be most profitable in the case of every individual boy and girl. Not merely ought it to draw on these experiences as a supplement to school work; it ought, whenever the educational growth of the individual

pupil may be served by so doing, to subordinate school work itself to the gaining of out-of-school experience.⁴⁵

6. *To provide periodic explanations to the supporting public of its policy in all the foregoing matters, and so far as possible to justify each major phase of its program to the public in terms of social return compared with expense.* Each element in the high-school program, as well as the secondary-school program as a whole, is a matter of legitimate public concern. Not merely additions to the physical plant and changes in the cost of running the schools, but additions to the schools' specific activities, changes in the schools' methods and material of teaching, and year-by-year measures of the schools' educational results, need to be fully explained and justified if the schools are to gain and to keep public confidence. Though the value of specific elements in the school program cannot always be measured in terms of thoroughly tangible returns, the nature of the returns which may fairly be expected should be kept constantly to the fore, both in planning the program and in justifying it to the public.

A Program for the Improvement of Conditions Which Make Universal Secondary Education Now Impracticable. It has already been pointed out that if the programs of individual schools are to approach maximum effectiveness, united action is essential. Such action must presumably be initiated by school people. It should be so planned as:

1. *To bring clearly to the attention of the public at large the limitations and possibilities of the present educational enterprise.* The same considerations which make it important for the individual school to explain and justify its program to the supporting public make necessary justification on a nation-wide scale of the general program of secondary education. Fundamental goals must be clearly defined and defended; the means by which these goals may be attained must be shown in sufficient detail to allow the public to judge of their necessity; the present accomplishment of the schools must be reported without being either minimized or exaggerated. Only to the extent that the public at large recognizes the need for an extended program of secondary education, and understands the steps which must be taken in order that such a program may be achieved, can the American secondary school be placed on a secure foundation.

⁴⁵For an elaboration of this recommendation, see the discussion of Issue II.

2. *To encourage large-scale experimentation with new methods and materials of teaching which may promise greater effectiveness in the secondary-school program even under present conditions, and to promote publication of the results of valuable experimentation, whatever its source.* The resources of individual schools are clearly inadequate to support the elaborate experimentation that needs to be carried on in order to add to the effectiveness of secondary education. Nor can individual schools working alone experiment to maximum advantage. Financial support must be found for experiments which will involve many schools in a coördinated search for the solutions to pressing educational problems; means must be made available for carefully controlled investigations outside the schools; an organization must be devised through which individual schools may be informed of the results of educational investigations elsewhere, and may be helped to incorporate these results in their own programs. Lacking unified and concerted effort to these ends, progress in educational research will continue to be, as it is at present, largely casual, ill coördinated, and without effective influence on current practice.

3. *To bring about improvement in existing systems of levying taxes for the support of schools.* The seriousness of the obstacles which existing tax systems present, not merely to an extension of the educational program but even to a continuation of the present program, emphasizes the need for concerted action to bring about a reform of these systems. Though reform with respect to school taxes must be attendant on revision of the tax structure as a whole, school people can do much to bring about the necessary changes. In particular they can help to demonstrate the urgent need for such change; and as the changes are made, they can draw attention to those features which an improved tax system ought to possess if it is to furnish a basis for an extended educational program.

4. *To effect the substitution of more just and economical plans of organization for the present small-district system, as a basis for expending schools funds.* If there is one factor more than any other which tends to make quality of educational opportunity under present conditions an unattainable fiction, it is the present district system of school organization. No individual school can change that system; the united action of school people within the several states will alone make possible any adequate remedy. Sufficient study has already been

devoted to the problem of school-district organization to allow a far closer approach to the equalization of educational opportunity than the school systems of most states now provide. If the ideal of universal secondary education is to be more nearly attained, concerted effort needs to be exerted toward securing better schemes of district organization no less than toward securing the adoption of an improved system of taxation.

ISSUE II

Shall secondary education seek to retain all pupils in school as long as they wish to remain, or shall it transfer them to other agencies under educational supervision when, in the judgment of the school authorities, these agencies promise to serve better the pupils' immediate and probable future needs?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

How long is it good for any boy or girl to stay in the secondary school?

Behind this question is the old, familiar dilemma of universal secondary education. Is it possible to differentiate the school program to care for individual differences in capacity and willingness to learn without incurring the dominance of mediocrity in an overburdened school system? Is it possible to relieve the secondary school of those pupils for whom the best schooling that we know how to give has become profitless without casting adrift in an inhospitable world many youngsters unprepared to face it? And in undertaking to guide pupils out of school is it possible to establish the point of diminishing educational returns without condemning to exile an Edison or a Scott.

The increasing number of boys and girls seeking a secondary education and the decreasing rate of elimination have created such a pressure within the schools that educators are being forced into the tortuous necessity of making a choice between further adapting the schools to all pupils or of recognizing the schools as selective institutions.

The school, of course, must see to it that a pupil has gained a reasonable command of the minimum essentials demanded by society and has made a direct trial of an adequate range of differentiated activities with the help of a broad program of guidance before it can consider that he has reached the point of diminishing educational returns. But if, with these safeguards, a pupil should fail—not by standards of effort or of group accomplishment, but in the sense of inability to attain or make reasonable progress toward some properly defined, socially valuable competence—then it would

seem that the policy of adapting the school to him should end, and a policy of finding some more constructive activity for him begin.

A failure to act at this stage makes the school, by so much, a custodial institution for the supervision of pupils whom educators could serve better by establishing a wisely-directed supplementary agency, distinct from the secondary school but nevertheless an integral and respectable part of the state educational system. If it be objected that profitable activity under wise direction is costly, profitless education is still more so.

There seems to be but one sensible way out of the dilemma. All American boys and girls should have the opportunity to secure a secondary education in which the program is differentiated according to their needs and adequate guidance is provided to help them take full advantage of it. Having established a program justly and effectively selective, educators should then move to establish a supplementary institution to which to transfer those boys and girls whose interests will in that way be better served. Not only that, but school people and the profession must take their program to the public before the public turns in desperation to the politicians to solve, perhaps ineffectively, a problem which to-morrow will press even more urgently for solution than to-day.

I. THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

The Issue Defined. The approved alternative of Issue I calls for the provision of secondary education at public expense for all normal individuals. According to the definition of secondary education adopted in the Introduction, this means that an appropriate form of education *in school* should be at the disposal of all normal individuals until they are prepared either to participate effectively in society unguided by the school or to engage successfully in the work of higher institutions. The definition does not imply, however, that secondary education is the only form of education above the elementary grades appropriate to the needs of all normal individuals who are not yet ready to take their places in society or in higher institutions. A variety of circumstances during the period of secondary education might conceivably call into question the advantages of further schooling. The opportunity for a trip around the world, for apprenticeship

to a fine workman, or for participation in a worthy, educational civic enterprise are examples of forms of education with which, if these opportunities should be afforded to certain pupils, the schools would ordinarily not care to compete. Persistent and apparently incurable failure in school work, assuming that every practicable effort has been made to adapt the work of the school to the needs of the individual, may also indicate the desirability of other forms of education. Thus the secondary school ought not to be thought of as providing the sole means of education, nor even in every instance the best means of education, for boys and girls who have completed the work of the elementary grades.

For the great majority of young people, however, a considerable amount of the type of experience which the secondary school provides, or might provide, is properly to be regarded as the most valuable sort of education likely to be available. The school affords a centralized, impartial agency in which the vocational possibilities of a great many occupational fields can be systematically explored, and in which guidance can be offered into the field for which an individual is best qualified; it can teach the social, scientific and technical background of many related fields without duplication, without distracting the attention of workers from their proper work, and without imposing on industry an undue educational burden which the division of labor characteristic of modern life would tend to transfer to another, more centralized agency; and it can mobilize the energies of youth for service in a comprehensive national plan to provide more effectively for the wants of all. It can also provide an opportunity to learn such desirable things as the optimum care of the body, deep and abiding interests in fields of science and scholarship untouched by the elementary school, and the necessary background for effective citizenship and worthy home membership. It can inculcate patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior upon which social coöperation is based, but which would tend to be overlooked in any other form of education. It can provide orientation and adjustment in the physical, social and cultural environment; the building of an integrated "world picture" based on scientific truth and informed with a social purpose. For all these reasons those in charge of American secondary schools have sought, with justice, actively to encourage the attendance of all boys and girls who have passed the elementary stage of their education.

The school's efforts toward retaining its pupils have not, however, met with complete success. Over 95 per cent of our boys and girls "drop out" of school during the period of secondary education—between grades seven and fourteen. As was demonstrated in the discussion of Issue I, this elimination has usually no relation to educational considerations. Many pupils drop out for whom continued schooling would undoubtedly be profitable—pupils for whom no further educational opportunities are locally available, whose families need their help or support, or who for some reason are unadjusted in the present program of secondary education.

Nor has the school been entirely successful in the case of pupils for whom some type of out-of-school experience might be of greater value than continued schooling. Always timid in its relations with the public, the school has usually taken no initiative in guiding pupils away from secondary education into other activities which may be more appropriate for them. As a result, numerous pupils have stayed on in school indefinitely, with no evident motive except that of overcoming the conventional hurdles of promotion and graduation, and with no apparent educational gain.

The existence of both these groups of pupils—those who are eliminated before they should be, and those who stay in school after their continued schooling has ceased to serve any valuable purpose—gives point to a question which no responsible secondary-school administrator can hope to avoid. *How long is it good for any boy or girl to stay in the secondary school?* More specifically: Does a sound program of school work for a particular individual ever reach a level of diminishing returns? If so, can this level of diminishing returns be detected, within reasonable limits, by the school authorities? Should the school authorities then assume responsibility for directing the individual into more appropriate activities? How can such activities be most effectively provided for boys and girls who are in need of them?

Arguments Favoring Continuance of Secondary Education as Long as Pupils Elect to Attend School. Present opinion on the underlying issue tends to be divided between those persons, on the one hand, who hold that the school should exercise no initiative in the matter of bringing the schooling of any pupil to an end, and those, on the other hand, who would have the school itself undertake responsibility for terminating the school careers of certain types of boys and girls.

The arguments of the former group are based on a variety of premises. The argument most commonly invoked, especially by parents who are demanding the continued education of their children at public expense, involves the assumption of the "right" of the individual to as much public education as he may wish. That there is no basis for this assumption in the Federal Constitution or the Federal statutes has already been pointed out.¹ The regulations of a number of local and state school systems, supplemented in certain instances by court decisions, have, however, given a measure of legal support to the assumption. The school census in most states includes all boys and girls from the ages of five or six to twenty or twenty-one, and children are generally accorded the right to attend school through their twentieth or twenty-first years. In certain states the school laws have been made explicit on this point. The Constitutional Provisions of the School Laws of Pennsylvania, for example, require that "the General Assembly shall provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of public schools wherein all the children of this Commonwealth, above the age of six years, may be educated"; and the courts have held that the word "children" applies to all individuals to the age of twenty-two. In the absence of definite legal provisions state departments of education have frequently authorized similar rulings; as, for example, in the case of one state department which has ruled that no child below the age of twenty-one may be excluded from school because he fails of promotion. City school systems have similarly dealt with the same question: a city superintendent in the Midwest has ordered that no pupil be failed of promotion in any course or grade. Practice in all these instances illustrates a prevalent tendency toward the continuance of educational opportunity for all, conditioned only upon regular attendance, good behavior, and reasonable industry.

A further defense of the policy of providing indefinitely continued opportunity for schooling is found in the assumption that however boys and girls may differ in their individual capacities and needs, all are capable of profiting in some important respect, to some important degree, by further schooling. This assumption is clearly apparent in a recent statement by a city superintendent of schools to the high school teachers of his system: "Never let it be said that when called upon to solve the educational problem of any boy or girl

¹See Section II of the discussion of Issue I.

we threw up our hands and cried, 'It can't be done. This child doesn't want to learn. He can't learn. He doesn't belong in school.' There is no such child. Every child belongs in school and there is something we can do for every one of them if we have but the determination and the will to discover the chord to which he responds."² The belief in the almost limitless possibilities of schooling which such a statement as this seems to imply is apparent.

A third argument rests on the unwillingness of school officials, or their assumed inability, to put a policy of discrimination into practical effect. This argument does not often appear in print, but it is frequently voiced in conferences of school principals and superintendents. Certain school officials, while they grant the theoretical desirability of attempting to discover appropriate terminal points for the schooling of individual pupils, nevertheless defend a *laissez-faire* policy on the ground that any attempt at positive action would arouse a storm of public disapproval. They maintain that the policy would "work" only so long as the children of influential citizens—whose prestige depends in some measure on the graduation of their children from a reputable college—were not affected. The argument is often added that the judgments of school people in such matters are liable to serious error. In most cases the bias would be in the direction of continued schooling; in the case of refractory but really promising pupils, however, it would often be toward elimination. Scott, Napoleon, and Edison, among others, are cited as examples of persons who achieved outstanding success despite small promise in school work. The possibility that the career of a pupil might be forever blighted by too early elimination from school, however conscientious and well-supported the judgment that led to the elimination, is held to justify complete abstinence from any action in this matter.

A final argument rests upon the scarcity of suitable employment for adolescents during the current depression. Although employment would not have been, in the past, the only alternative to continued schooling, it would almost always have absorbed the vast majority of the pupils who did not continue their education in higher institutions. At present nearly all boys and girls under eighteen years of age who are not in school, and many older boys and girls who have left school, are unemployed, unsupervised, and unprotected. Sub-

²Superintendent Harold G. Campbell of New York City, quoted in *The Journal of the National Education Association*, XXVIII, 5:136 (May, 1934).

ject to possible exploitation on the one hand and to the deterioration of character that may come from idleness on the other, their situation constitutes a menace not merely to themselves but to the whole social order. The school represents a social agency which can do much to protect these boys and girls. It is, in fact, the only existing agency which can offer them protection on any extensive scale. Some social agency, it is held, must assume responsibility for them; and many who are seriously concerned with this problem maintain that the school is the logical agency to do so.

Arguments Opposing Continuance of Secondary Schooling for Certain Types of Individuals. The arguments of those who favor discrimination by school authorities as to the amount of schooling to be granted to individual pupils parallel in general the arguments which have already been cited in opposition to a system of universal public secondary education.³ They rest in the main on the assumption that individual differences in capacity to learn, coupled with differences in willingness to learn, make indefinitely continued schooling inadvisable for certain individuals.

The point of view of those who bear the financial burden of support of the schools is represented by a statement of the Junior Education and Employment Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers:

The doors of the higher institutions [i.e., the secondary schools] should not be closed to anybody who is able and willing to learn, but society cannot afford to maintain high schools for young people who use them merely as pleasure resorts. . . . Society ought to assume through its schools the obligation to the younger generation of seeing that all have a reasonable chance to make of themselves whatever they can, but society ought not to carry the burden of young people who having had in the fullest sense their fair chance will not do their part, or are unable to profit by the opportunities offered.⁴

From the point of view of those responsible for the administration of the schools, a similar argument is frequently advanced. It has recently been used in justification of a ruling by the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore. The ruling in question provides that pupils over sixteen years of age who have failed in two or more major subjects during any school year, unless the failure has been due to illness, shall be permanently dropped from the schools. Guidance is offered to pupils who are in danger of failing in order to assist

³See Section I of the discussion of Issue I.

⁴Junior Education and Employment Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers: *National Education and Employment Program*, p. 7 (September 5, 1927). New York (50 Church Street).

them in adjusting to their difficulties or in finding other courses in which they may succeed, but pupils who fail because they do not make sufficient effort in school work are given no further consideration. In commenting on this ruling, the *Baltimore Bulletin of Education* defends the dismissal of irresponsible pupils as follows:

"For many years there have been in our high schools large numbers of pupils who enjoy the school as though it were a juvenile country club. The associations are pleasant; the buildings are warm, clean, and fairly comfortable; the opportunity for participation in athletics is better than can be found in any outside organization; the food in the cafeteria is inexpensive and quite palatable; in fact, barring the unpleasantness of being expected to work, it is a very agreeable place in which to spend one's time. But after a boy has reached his late teens, should he be permitted to enjoy such privileges at the city's expense, without taking his work seriously, without putting forth sufficient effort to do his work well? If it is recreation and entertainment that are desired, they can be provided much more economically than education, and probably belong to some other organization, not the school. The high school exists to prepare pupils for life, either to take their places among the workmen of to-morrow as happy, helpful citizens, or to continue their work in college. If young men and young women wish to avail themselves of the privilege of a public high-school education, they must take their opportunity seriously, and be willing to work, or else forfeit the privilege."⁵

The foregoing statements present the list of most current arguments against indefinitely continued schooling for all. Certain further quotations are pertinent, however, as illustrating a phase of the argument for selection which is somewhat less often presented.

The first of these quotations is drawn from a series of suggestions for improving the work of the junior high school, formulated by a member of the New York State Department of Education interested in secondary education from the standpoint of a psychiatrist.

Our future progress in the arts and sciences and civilization largely depends on the quality and production of our more intellectually gifted and talented children. The weeding out from our schools of the grosser forms of intellectually and physically handicapped children . . . will greatly assist in minimizing the water-logged condition of our schools. An opportunity will thus be afforded to stimulate activity in the more abstract and symbolizing forms of mentation in pupils who will major in academic programs and go on to college.⁶

The second quotation comes from a writer who has sought to trace the changing outcomes of secondary education in America in terms of the changing methods and pur-

⁵"The Privilege of a High-School Education." *Baltimore Bulletin of Education*, November, 1933, pp. 17-18.

⁶Frederick L. Patry: "Psychiatry and the Junior High School." *Junior-Senior High-School Clearing House*, VIII, 3:163 (November, 1933).

poses of the secondary school. As a result of his analysis he proposes certain questions which will have to be faced before the proper goal of secondary education—"preparation of youth, all youth, for worthy living in the world of to-day and of to-morrow"—can be adequately attained.

Is it really possible [he asks] to supply in a single institution conditions essential to the worthy education of all youth of a community? In assuming this responsibility, is not the secondary school undertaking more than it can possibly do satisfactorily? In its efforts to educate the total range of youth democratically, as it claims, can the school avoid the dominance of conditions of mediocrity, which fail adequately to meet the educational needs of any, especially of those in the extreme ranges of intellectual capacity? If it should appear that the secondary school has undertaken more than it can perform, what is to be done? How is the whole job to be handled? Where numbers are sufficient, will it be better to differentiate the cosmopolitan school into several types, each better suited to the education of its enrollment? Or, for the education of some youth must an institution, or institutions, be provided so different from our present schools that they could hardly be called schools at all?

And, finally, there might arise these further questions: In excluding all youth from employment, are we not excluding many from an environment more educational for them than any other that we know how to supply? Is it not possible to preserve for youths who need it the educational advantages of employment, while sparing them the burdens that have so generally afflicted child labor?¹

It is apparent from these latter statements that the policy of selection finds support not alone from those who fear a misuse of public funds under a plan permitting indefinitely continued schooling, but from those who view discrimination as to length of schooling as a means of safeguarding the interests of both the more able and the less able among high-school boys and girls.

Both the financial and the educational arguments for discrimination are admirably summarized in the concluding paragraphs of an article by Professor Edward L. Thorndike, of Columbia University. On the basis of evidence gained in a study of the differing school histories of pupils of differing mental abilities, Professor Thorndike shows that the present quantitative distribution of education largely ignores the intellectual abilities of the recipients.

Zeal to produce more schooling, that is, to increase the amount of schooling given in our country, has been one of America's fine idealisms. Such zeal should be maintained, but with it there should be equal zeal to distribute this education so that those will have most who can use it best. What evidence we now have indicates that the ablest receive very little more than the least able. For every boy of the top forty of our 785

¹Frank E. Spaulding: "The Progressive Debilitation of the Secondary School." *Harvard Teachers Record*, IV, 3:135 (June, 1934).

who stayed in school beyond the age of eighteen, there were nearly ten boys below average ability who did so. The passion for equalization which had a certain nobility when a large percentage of children barely learned to read and write becomes unwise, almost ridiculous, when the question is of spending our resources to keep in school boys of sixteen, or seventeen, or eighteen who would be happier or more useful at work or at play. Our increased resources should be used to aid young men and women whom nature and nurture have chosen to profit from schooling.

Doubtless, great ability will often manage to get education outside of schools or to get along without it, but those who can do so much for the world with so little are the very ones who should be given more. In the wars we are incessantly waging against disease, misery, depravity, injustice, and ugliness, we should not provide our best marksmen with the poorest weapons nor ask our bravest to fight with their naked hands.³

The Historical Background of the Issue. The question as to how long it is good for any given boy or girl to stay in the secondary school has come into prominence as a result of the same social and economic changes which have brought the more general issue of the desirability of universal secondary education into the foreground of educational controversy. Technological change has provided the leisure and the economic security which have made it possible for increasing numbers of pupils to attend the secondary school. Widespread belief in the advantages of secondary education, based partly on a sound recognition of the growing need by everyone for more education, partly on a blind faith in the virtues of schooling *per se*, has filled the secondary school with an increasingly heterogeneous group of pupils. These factors, working in conjunction with each other, have placed the secondary school in a position in which it cannot avoid taking some positive stand with respect to the length of time for which it will provide schooling for individual boys and girls.

Prior to 1930 the desirability of taking any such stand could be ignored, and in practice was very generally ignored, by individual secondary schools. Though high-school enrollments had been undergoing extraordinary expansion since 1900, approximately doubling within each decade,⁴ one factor had kept the issue from becoming acute. That factor was the high rate of elimination. Despite their faith in the advantages of schooling, relatively few parents could or would keep their children in school with a persistent record of failure behind them. Except during the depression of 1921, moreover, employment for adolescents was in general easy to se-

³Edward L. Thorndike: "The Distribution of Education." *School Review*, XL, 5:344-45 (May, 1932).

⁴For a chart showing percentage increases, see G. N. Kefauver, V. H. Noll, and C. E. Drake: *The Secondary-School Population*, p. 2. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 4. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

cure, and boys and girls were themselves continually tempted to leave school because of the availability of jobs. The pupils who dropped out of their own accord were by no means restricted, of course, to those who were unable or unwilling to profit by the education which the secondary school was able to offer them; nor were the pupils who remained in school confined to those who could make the most advantageous use of a continued institutional education. But as studies of elimination during this period tended to show,¹⁰ the group leaving school was predominantly composed of boys and girls who had been relatively unsuccessful from an academic standpoint. Thus the secondary schools found themselves relieved of much necessity for facing the question of whether length of schooling was to be restricted in the case of individual pupils, by the tendency of pupils and their parents to exercise such restriction on their own account.

The events of the present depression have brought the issue to a point at which few schools can ignore it. With the closing of almost all avenues of employment to adolescents, hundreds of thousands of boys and girls who would previously have dropped out of school within the secondary-school period have now elected to continue their schooling. Pupils who have completed the formal secondary-school program, moreover, have in large numbers applied for readmission to the high school as postgraduates. The insistence of the pressure which the latter group of pupils, in particular, have exerted to be allowed to continue in school, may be judged from the fact that in a number of cities where postgraduates have had to be denied admission, senior students have intentionally failed their final courses in order to be classed for one more year as undergraduates. No doubt a desire to gain further education as a possible insurance against future depressions, or against a continuance of the present depression, has motivated much of the demand for more schooling. The larger part of this demand has probably arisen, however, from the fact that to continue in school is the only course at present open to most adolescent boys and girls who would avoid sheer idleness. Whatever the source of the demand, its widespread strength is a clear indication of the fact that the high school can no longer avail itself of more or less automatic and progressive elimination as a means of discriminating between pupils who should remain in school and pupils who, perhaps,

¹⁰See for example, the list of studies referred to by Kefauver, Noll, and Drake, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

would derive greater profit both for themselves and for society from out-of-school activities.

In consequence of the pressure from pupils regularly enrolled as undergraduates, as well as from those who seek readmission as postgraduates, the high-school population has in all probability shown an increase since 1930 even more abrupt than the phenomenal increase during the preceding decade.¹¹ Nor is the pressure likely to be greatly relieved with the return of prosperity. The depression has in effect merely crystalized certain tendencies which have long been operative in less extreme form. The closing of employment to adolescents, especially, is likely to represent a permanent characteristic of the American economic system. No doubt the demand for continued schooling will lessen temporarily as the economic situation improves. But the lessening of this demand will probably be no more than temporary. Prominent industrialists foresee an eventual raising of the minimum age for vocational employment far above its present level; the historic policy of the American Federation of Labor suggests that organized labor is likely to work actively toward this end. Under such circumstances there cannot fail to arise a steadily increasing desire on the part of a growing proportion of boys and girls to be allowed to continue in school. The estimated enrollment in 1935 of some seventy per cent of American boys and girls of high-school age in the public secondary schools must inevitably be regarded merely as a part-way mark in the growth of the high-school population, and not as the culmination of that growth.

It should be noted that the issue as to discrimination is aggravated not so much by the sudden increase in the numbers of high-school pupils as by the types of pupils involved. Of the pupils who have been added to the enrollment since 1930 and of the increasing numbers who are likely to be added in the future, the majority doubtless consist of boys and girls who possess obvious ability to profit by continued schooling. These are the pupils whose earlier elimination was a cause for serious concern. The school has long fought elimination on their account; it knows how to provide for their needs, and it can regard their present continuance in school as a matter for legitimate congratulation. But a very considerable proportion of the new enrollment is comprised of pupils of a different type—boys and girls who are almost mature

¹¹No thoroughly reliable figures on the growth of the high-school enrollment since 1930 are as yet available for the United States as a whole.

physically, who are normal mentally in the sense that they are quite capable of holding their own with the ordinary adult, but who are unable or unwilling to deal successfully with continued study under the conditions which even the best secondary schools impose. The fact that many of these pupils would far rather be out of school at work than in school, even at play, makes their problem the more difficult of solution. These are the pupils who give rise to the objections to indefinitely continued schooling which have been cited earlier. And it is in terms of these pupils particularly that the school must shape its policy as to continued education.

The present situation may be summarized in the statement that the public secondary school is faced, as it has never been faced before, with the need to establish a clear-cut and defensible policy as to the amount of schooling which it will offer to any individual boy or girl. Automatic elimination within the secondary-school period has been suddenly reduced, and is perhaps in process of being almost entirely wiped out, by events quite beyond the school's control. In consequence, the secondary school finds itself at the beginning of a period in which it can do more for some of its pupils than it has ever been able to do previously, but in which the unsolved problem of what to do with and for certain types of boys and girls is likely to press upon it with increasing intensity.

II. DIMINISHING RETURNS FROM SCHOOL WORK

The issue as to whether the secondary school should take some positive stand in terminating the schooling of certain of its pupils can be logically resolved only through a consideration of more specific questions. The first of these questions concerns the possible occurrence of diminishing returns from continued schooling in the case of any individual. In the resolution of Issue I the need has been emphasized for extending an opportunity for secondary education to every American boy and girl. One may grant the existence of this need; one may grant also that the opportunity to attend the secondary school should continue to be open to every pupil for so long as his continued schooling is of value to him and through him to the society which supports the schools. Does there, however, come a time when further secondary-school work promises so little advantage to certain boys and girls that their continuance in school is of questionable value?

The Problem Exemplified. The nature of this question may be clarified by considering the case of a boy who enters a very good school and decides, after thorough and adequate guidance, to become a carpenter. A sound program of education—both general and vocational—is built around this central purpose, and after three years the boy, with all the background necessary for responsible citizenship, is judged competent to enter on his calling. At this time a reputable employer offers to take the boy into his service. The boy's parents object on the ground that for reasons of social prestige the boy ought to go to college; they insist that he must remain in school. Could this very good secondary school re-direct the boy's purposes and give him one more year of school work which would continue to be of solid value to himself and to society? Could it give him two more years? Assuming that the boy was not gifted with high academic intelligence, could he be given five or six more years of schooling at public expense beyond the point at which he was ready to enter upon his calling, and derive sufficient benefit to justify the added expense to himself and to society?

Many educators assume that schooling may be expanded indefinitely in this fashion. For certain very gifted and adaptable individuals, perhaps it may. If it could not, however, how might the school recognize the fact? Would it not be through the pupil's loss of interest in school work despite the most skillful adaptation of teaching methods to individual needs, through his consequent lack of effort to learn, and through his failure to progress in the increasingly abstract and technical subject matter that the higher levels of schooling necessarily involve?

Diminishing Educational Returns in General. If a level of diminishing returns did not occur in the processes of education, it would not be necessary to give serious attention to the problem of terminating secondary education. Boys and girls might be allowed to remain in school as long as their circumstances permitted, with assurance that each additional year added an equal or greater amount to their personal and social effectiveness. But though there is at present no strictly scientific evidence that such a level does appear, common sense and common practice assumes that it does. No one would advocate the indefinitely continued schooling of a congenital imbecile at public expense; nor would anyone be likely to favor the provision of public education even for a genius much beyond the level of three or four years of graduate

study in a university. In view of the facts of individual differences it seems reasonable to assume that the onset of diminishing returns in education varies for normal individuals between these two extremes.

Diminishing Returns from Secondary Education. If lack of interest, lack of effort, and failure to make progress in learning may be tentatively accepted as symptoms of the onset of diminishing educational returns, are these symptoms ever observed among pupils in secondary schools? Many acute observers report that they are—frequently, in fact. It may be objected that they are preceded by no such careful preparation for a well-defined goal as in the case of the boy who wanted to become a carpenter, and by no such offer of employment in most cases at the present time. Their appearance would only be hastened, however, by a less effective education than the one proposed as an example. If pupils who might well become carpenters are given no training in carpentry but are held to an increasingly abstract and difficult academic program, with no apparent relationship to anything that interests them, they are likely even sooner to serve notice on the educational authorities that they have submitted to all the school work they can bear. Beyond this point further schooling of the same sort is likely to be mere time-serving, rather than a profitable investment for the individual and for the society which pays for his education.

Diminishing Returns from the Program of the Average School. Under present conditions in the average secondary school the level of diminishing returns seems to appear well within the period of secondary education for many boys and girls. These pupils are to be identified by every symptom that could reasonably be associated with the lessening effectiveness of educational processes. There are boys and girls who have apparently reached a plateau so far as learning of greater difficulty is concerned, and for whom continued learning at the same level of difficulty means little more than busy-work. Some have become so used to failure in school work that they are openly scornful of any effort to learn. Others could learn if they would, but whether through the imperfect adaptation of school work to their needs, or through failure to acquire a sense of social responsibility in the somewhat artificial environment necessarily imposed by the school, or through the onset of maturity which has transferred their interests elsewhere, they seem to have lost all interest in

school work and make almost no effort to learn. Such pupils by their disturbing behavior inevitably become the focus of attention in school, and teachers put forth an extraordinary effort to capture their attention and coöperation. Some of these pupils improve, but a great many make no significant progress toward any of the important objectives of the school over long periods of time. The amount of attention paid to them may be justified on the ground that it tends in the long run to modify the traditional curriculum, but for any given pupil, when progress toward important objectives has ceased despite all that the school has been able to do, the futility of further school work of the same sort can hardly be denied.

Modifications of the Secondary-School Program in Progressive Schools. It will of course be objected that the reason for lack of progress toward educational goals in many cases lies not with the pupil but with the school. Particularly is this likely to be true under the narrow and highly academic programs provided at present by the majority of American secondary schools. Progressive public schools, through a variety of improvements in the traditional methods, curriculum, and organization, have shown themselves able to reduce to a minimum the number of pupils not profiting by school work. It is clearly incumbent on every school to incorporate in its own practice the methods which the better schools have found effective before assuming that it has done all that can be done for irresponsible and failing pupils.

Yet even in the best of our present schools the problem of diminishing educational returns still exists. Whether a school is progressive or conservative, the mere fact of its being a school means that the environment which it provides is an artificial one—in many respects no more than a mirror of the life which its pupils will meet outside of school, and to which its older and maturer pupils are often consciously looking forward. In the case of pupils whose interest is strongly centered on out-of-school activities, even the best schools may quite conceivably have reached the limit of the possibility of educating effectively through *school* experiences. What is needed for such pupils is a type of experience less artificial and more life-like than any school, however informal, can well provide.

In the light of all these considerations the question as to whether diminishing returns are likely to occur for certain pupils in the course of their secondary-school work must inevitably be answered in the affirmative. The narrower,

more formal, and more academic a school's program, the larger will be the number of boys and girls for whom continued attendance in that school offers no substantial promise. Yet even under the best secondary-school conditions which we now know how to create, there will be certain pupils for whom non-school activities are likely to be of greater value than continuance in school till the last possible day or year. No conscientious administrator can afford to overlook the existence of these pupils, or to take such measures as will enable him to provide as fully as possible for their welfare.

III. THE DETECTION OF DIMINISHING RETURNS FROM SCHOOLING IN THE CASE OF INDIVIDUAL PUPILS

It has been suggested that lack of interest, lack of effort, and failure to make progress in learning constitute important symptoms of the onset of diminishing educational returns. The question of how long it is good for any individual boy or girl to stay in school cannot be answered, however, in terms of a mere general naming of these symptoms. Fortunately it seems possible to set up more definite criteria than these, by which to determine whether a given pupil's schooling may be profitably continued, or whether he might with greater advantage engage in some non-school activity.

Opportunities to be Assured to Every Pupil. Obviously no boy or girl can be considered to have reached a level of diminishing returns from school work until he has had full chance to profit from such educational opportunities as the secondary school is designed to offer. This means that the question of whether it is better for a given pupil to stay in school or to leave can hardly arise until the pupil has been given an opportunity, first, to master certain basic skills and understandings, and second, to test his interest and ability in such specialized types of school work as may be of advantage to him.

No pupil should be encouraged, or even permitted, to leave the secondary school until he has gained reasonable command of at least the "minimum essentials"—that is, until his grasp of the tool skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic and his command of the fundamental facts of social relationships are sufficient to enable him to "get along" outside the school.

Provision of the minimum essentials is commonly regarded as a function of the elementary school. The often de-

sirable practice, however, of promoting certain pupils to the secondary school without strict regard for their elementary-school achievement means that in many school systems pupils will be found in the secondary grades who are deficient in these fundamental abilities. Furthermore, the rising standard of achievement in the minimum essentials which boys and girls must meet in order to hold their own outside the school places on the secondary school the responsibility for adding to the training which the elementary school provides. A boy or girl not equipped with a usable command of these skills can hardly be expected to adjust himself adequately to out-of-school demands. For its own protection, society cannot well afford to allow any such boy or girl to substitute for continued schooling any form of activity, however valuable from other standpoints, which neglects these essentials.

Nor is it unreasonable to insist that the secondary school assure itself of a mastery of the minimum essentials on the part of all its pupils. The value of practical skill in the essentials is so evident that few boys or girls, given reasonably good teaching, are likely to be averse to the effort required to master them. Teaching methods in these subjects have been developed to a point at which no normal individual can be regarded as incapable of acquiring the skills involved. This is true even when "normal" is defined in the broadest possible sense. Pupils who encounter special difficulties with the tool skills may need, and should be given, special instruction. But only pupils who are seriously deficient in fundamental ability to learn should be excepted from the requirement of a usable command of these skills; and such pupils will more appropriately be enrolled in schools for the sub-normal than in the usual secondary school.

No pupil should be encouraged to leave the secondary school until, in addition to mastering the minimum essentials, he has had opportunity for direct trial of every practicable type of instruction which may reasonably be assumed to be adapted to his needs. This safeguard is of course necessary only in the case of pupils who have not thus far been successful in their work. It should include not only a trial of the differentiated curricula which a well-organized secondary school may offer, but adaptation of subject-matter and methods of instruction to the pupil's needs and problems, such as any really flexible educational program provides.

Trial of varied types of differentiated curricula should properly extend far beyond the confines of the conventional

academic program. The need for trained workers not merely in the professions, but in business, industry, agriculture, and the arts, is so great that the secondary school can properly establish wide differentiations in its offerings. Indeed it must do so if it is to meet the varied educational demands of our present civilization.

The training required for these fields calls for the exercise of a great variety of interests and skills. Hence a pupil's lack of success in any one type of curriculum offers no sound basis for the assumption that he has reached a level of diminishing returns from secondary-school work in general. Especially is this true of lack of success in formal academic work: experience with differentiated curricula has amply demonstrated that pupils who are unable or unwilling to apply themselves successfully to academic subject-matter are often able to pursue with profit curricula emphasizing less highly intellectualized training. Until a pupil has had a chance to try himself out in each major field of training which the secondary school may appropriately offer, his inability to profit by continued schooling cannot have been shown. Though he may have demonstrated inability to succeed in particular studies and though he may justly be encouraged to abandon his efforts in connection with those studies, the school cannot consider its own responsibility fully met until every reasonable differentiation has been attempted.

The importance of providing opportunity for a wide range of differentiations emphasizes the need for careful attention to pupil guidance in the secondary school. Particularly in the junior high-school grades, where pupils receive their introduction to the specialized work of the secondary school, the desirability of giving all necessary assistance to each individual in his choice of specialized subjects and curricula is apparent. The guidance which the school affords should not, however, be restricted to efforts to help each boy and girl choose a field of specialization wisely. It should be concerned also, if the school is to make its teaching fully effective, with assisting each pupil to make the most of the particular type of education which he elects. The latter undertaking is no less essential than the former in a program which seeks the closest possible approach to equality of educational opportunity. Not until the secondary school has provided as fully as its resources permit for guidance from the standpoint of adaptation

and distribution both¹² can it wisely direct any of its pupils into out-of-school activities on the ground of the pupil's failure to benefit from school work.

The importance of providing opportunity for a wide range of differentiations emphasizes also the financial impasse in which thousands of American secondary schools now find themselves. Large secondary schools can ordinarily provide economically for practically all the differentiations which are socially profitable. In a large school which uses its resources to the full, a pupil may accordingly be given every reasonable chance to take advantage of the educational opportunities which should be his. Not all large schools by any means actually provide such a chance for every pupil, but their failure to do so would seem to arise more often from administrative weaknesses or defects in educational policy than from the schools' financial handicaps.¹³ Small schools, however, are obliged by the limitations on their financial resources to restrict their provisions for differentiation. To offer the whole range of desirable opportunities is impracticable; small schools must choose those curricula which meet the needs either of the majority of their pupils, or of the pupils whose needs seem most pressing. In so doing the schools perforce neglect many boys and girls who might profitably continue their education were their special interests and abilities adequately met in the schools' programs.

Hence small schools in particular need to be alert to the limitations of their existing programs. Those limitations cannot be completely removed so long as small schools continue to exist. But the school which is sensitive to them will recognize that lack of success in its own curricula is no fair indication of pupils' inability to profit by continued schooling, and will seek to make possible the transfer of such pupils to schools offering differentiations more likely to be appropriate.

Meanwhile the small school must be no less concerned than the large school to provide all the socially valuable differentiations which its resources permit. The average secondary school, whether large or small, now lags far behind the better schools in the use which it makes of its resources

¹²For a full discussion of both these phases of guidance and of the techniques thus far developed in connection with them, see L. V. Koos and G. N. Kefauver: *Guidance in Secondary Schools*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932.

¹³For evidence supporting this conclusion, and for an analysis of the handicaps under which schools of various sizes must work, see F. T. Spaulding, O. I. Frederick, and L. V. Koos: *The Reorganization of Secondary Education*, Division I, Chapter VIII: "Small High Schools Compared with Large High Schools." National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 5, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

in this respect.¹⁴ Whatever their present financial handicaps may be, the great majority of schools could unquestionably do much more than they now do to provide valuable activities for pupils who are not profiting from established curricula. Their first effort ought to be in this direction. Not until they have exhausted all reasonable possibilities of differentiation can they justly conclude that any pupil has reached a level of diminishing returns from school work.

Positive Evidence of Diminishing Educational Returns.

But when a school has conscientiously applied both these safeguards—insistence on mastery of the minimum essentials and provision for direct trial of an adequate range of differentiated activities—it should then be exceedingly sensitive to evidence of lack of progress toward its objectives on the part of any pupil over long periods of time. A temporary plateau in learning may be disregarded, but an almost complete cessation of progress over a period of a year is a danger signal which the school cannot afford to disregard. Evidence of this lack of progress may be secured through a variety of school records—course records, records of tests and examinations, records of creative expression, anecdotal records, personnel records of various sorts, and the like. Evidence from any and all of these sources may be highly significant.

The type of evidence which is most obviously pertinent, and upon which most schools will have to place chief reliance, is that which is commonly stated in terms of "failure" in school work. "Failure" is so variously interpreted by school people that the term needs definition if its use in the present discussion is to be clearly understood. There are at least three senses in which a pupil may be said to be "failing" in school; yet in only one of these senses can his failure be justly regarded as a symptom of his having reached a level of diminishing educational returns.

In the first sense, the term "failure" is used to denote a pupil's non-achievement of certain set standards for a given grade or a given subject. Under schemes of marking in which fixed requirements must be met in order to insure "passing,"

¹⁴For a description of practice in the average "reorganized" school, see F. T. Spaulding, O. I. Frederick, and L. V. Koos, *op. cit.*, Division I, Chapter III. For comparisons of practice in average schools and superior schools see *ibid.*, Chapter X, and E. N. Ferriss, W. H. Gaumnitz, and P. R. Brammell: *The Smaller Secondary Schools*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 6. Examples of promising methods of providing appropriate differentiations are presented in Parts I-III of Roy O. Billett: *Provisions for Individual Differences, Marking, and Promotion*, National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 13. All these monographs are published as sections of U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

An extended discussion of desirable differentiations in the secondary-school program is presented in connection with Issue IV.

most failures are of this sort. The term supposedly has an absolute meaning, in that it involves an effort to measure each pupil's achievement against an impersonal and external criterion.

In the second sense, "failure" implies a quality of work so far below the average for the group with which the pupil is placed that he cannot advantageously continue with that group. The meaning of the term is here relative rather than absolute, since each pupil's achievement is judged in terms of that of the group to which he is assigned. Marking systems which require the granting of predetermined proportions of passing and failing marks result in failures of this type. Many of the failures recorded under such systems are failures also in the first sense of the term; but the term used in the latter sense does not necessarily imply failure in the first sense. Thus a pupil of average ability placed in a superior group may "fail" according to this second meaning, even though he has learned much during the period of his work with the group in question.

"Failure" in the third sense implies achievement markedly lower in quality than that of which the pupil concerned is reasonably capable. Marking systems which take into account the achievement or accomplishment quotient—the ratio between the quality of a pupil's school work and his ability as determined by standardized tests of intelligence—tend to emphasize this type of failure. As in the second meaning of the term, "failure" is here a relative matter, but the standard to be met is determined by the pupil's own ability rather than by the progress of the group in which he is placed. Failure in this third sense may have little or no relationship to failure in the sense of non-achievement of an external standard. Thus an unusually able pupil may be said to have "failed," even though he has kept up with his group and has met supposedly absolute grade or subject standards, because he has done less well than he could have done if he had applied himself to the full; or a very dull pupil may be held not to have "failed" because he has made as much progress as could reasonably be expected of him, despite the fact that he has lagged far behind his group and has met none of the usual external standards in his work.

Failure in school work has come to be more and more frequently interpreted in one or both of the last two senses, in an effort to avoid failure in terms of external standards. As a criterion for determining whether a pupil has reached a level

of diminishing returns from school work, however, failure cannot justly be interpreted according to either of these meanings. That a pupil is failing in the sense that he is not "keeping up" with his group, or that he is not doing the best of which he is capable, is a matter of indubitable concern both to the pupil and to the school. For the sake of its own efficiency, the school needs to recognize such failures, and to revise its procedure in whatever ways may be appropriate in order that it may deal with them effectively. But a pupil's failure to keep pace with his group, or to do his best, is in itself an indication merely that the school environment or the school procedure is not as well adapted to his needs as it ought to be. In the one case changes in administrative procedure or in class organization are clearly called for; in the other case changes in teaching method should be attempted, as a means of removing the cause of the failure. The concern which such failures arouse should be with respect to the means by which the school is undertaking its task, and not with respect to whether the school has reached the end of its task. In neither case does the failure provide dependable evidence that the pupil is unlikely to profit by continued schooling.

Conversely, a pupil's success as judged by these standards offers no sure indication that his continued schooling will be of value. Even though he is doing as well as other pupils with whom he is placed, the standards for the whole group may have been set so low as to make the accomplishment of any member of the group worth less than it costs to produce. This would seem to be the case at present in many courses in foreign language, for example, in which the actual achievement of thousands of pupils is practically negligible from the standpoint of either individual or social worth. Furthermore, even though a pupil is conscientiously doing the best of which he is reasonably capable, that best may not be good enough to justify his continued effort. To train a tone-deaf person in musical harmony, even though he put forth every reasonable effort to learn, would be a senseless waste both of public funds and of the pupil's time and energy. To continue the training of a pupil for any specialized activity in which limitations on his natural or acquired abilities represent a permanent and serious handicap is no less wasteful, however earnest and painstaking the pupil's effort may be.

Nor does failure in the first sense—that is, failure to meet an external standard—justify the school in directing a pupil into some form of non-school activity, if the standard em-

ployed is of the sort which many schools now impose. Numerous schools tend to judge their pupils' success in terms of external measures which are at best meaningless and are often palpably unsound.

External standards of the meaningless sort are illustrated in the use of marking systems in which a minimum "per cent"—commonly 60% or 70%—is arbitrarily required for "passing." The most that can be read into a failing mark assigned on this basis is that a pupil has not met a certain proportion of the tests which his teachers have set for him. As to what the significance of the tests has been in terms of any valuable accomplishment on the pupil's part, or as to whether, despite his mark, the pupil's actual accomplishment has been sufficient to justify his continuance in school, no one outside the school—sometimes no one even in the school—can possibly tell.

External standards which are positively unsound are found in schools which set up certain arbitrary requirements as hurdles for pupils to overcome. Such requirements commonly involve the "passing" of specified academic subjects, with "passing" defined sometimes in terms of a percentage mark, sometimes on another basis. Thus hundreds of secondary schools still require each pupil to "pass" in a certain fixed proportion of his subjects in one grade before he may undertake any subjects in the succeeding grade, no matter how sound his preparation for some of the work of the latter grade may be; and hundreds of other schools require all pupils to "pass" in specific subjects—ninth-grade algebra, for example, or ancient history—despite the fact that the subjects in question may have no direct relation whatever to the program which represents a given pupil's best chance for continued educational profit.

External standards such as these constitute what is often no more than an educational abracadabra. Certainly they bear little relation to the concern with actual living which should be the secondary school's chief preoccupation. To conclude that pupils are no longer likely to profit from continued schooling because of their failure to meet any such purely academic shibboleths would be to commit the densest of stupidities.

Yet when one considers the intent of society in supporting free secondary education, and of those pupils who have a serious educational purpose in pursuing their school work, it becomes evident that failure in terms of one sort of external

and more or less absolute standard provides crucial indication of the onset of diminishing educational returns. The public pays for secondary schools to the end that boys and girls may be so educated as to be "good" at something in which competence is worth paying for. Pupils themselves expect that as a result of their schooling they will have attained some such competence. The range of activities in which competence is valuable is very wide, and American society grants almost unlimited freedom to each boy and girl in choosing the type of activity in which he shall become competent. But unless a boy or girl does eventually become competent at some useful activity, he has failed to achieve the purpose of his schooling. Moreover, unless he uses each part of his school work in such a way as to advance him appreciably in some valuable competence, he has failed in that part of it. And the competence which both society and the individual demand is not established by reference merely to the ability of the individual pupil, nor even by reference to the accomplishment of the school group in which the pupil is placed. In the last analysis it is determined by conditions quite external both to the individual pupil and to the school. It is established for any individual pupil by the conditions which he must face *after he leaves school* in gaining a place for himself in society.

Once a pupil has mastered the minimum essentials, therefore, and has been given full opportunity under adequate guidance to try himself out in the various major types of work which the secondary school can appropriately offer, his continued failure to attain or to make reasonable progress toward valuable competence in some one of these types of work represents just ground for considering that he has reached a level of diminishing returns from continued schooling. For any boy or girl to keep on in school when his work is resulting in this type of failure can amount, at best, to no more than his marking time educationally. At worst it may mean for the pupil concerned either a delusion of progress from which he must later painfully recover, or a sense of defeat which he will carry with him to his hurt long after he eventually leaves the school.

The Appropriate Definition of Failure Illustrated. To recognize the application of this conclusion in general is obviously much simpler than to formulate and put into effect appropriate standards for specific high-school courses. The conclusion is not a mere abstraction, however. Its implica-

tions can be readily illustrated in almost any one of the fields with which the high-school curriculum commonly deals.

Failure to attain the competence to which this conclusion refers is easiest to recognize in studies which have a vocational purpose. The specialized course in stenography may provide an example. The teacher of such a course can find, if he seeks it, a thoroughly pragmatic definition of competence in his field: competence as a stenographer means ability under normal conditions to obtain and fill successfully a stenographic position, in fair competition with other trained persons who are seeking such a position. The pupil enrolled in the stenographic course who does not eventually become able to get and hold a position, or who makes no appreciable progress toward the ability to do so, has failed in his work. No matter that he may have done his best. No matter that he may have done as well as many other pupils in his class. Unless he has attained this end his education as a stenographer has resulted in no promise of any valuable return from his work, so far as that work has had a specialized vocational purpose.

A similar definition of failure applies to any other strictly vocational curriculum which the secondary school may offer. In certain curricula the vocational objectives which are sought may be less narrowly defined and less immediate than in the specialized course in stenography. Pupils in such curricula are likely to have open to them a variety of specialized occupations among which to choose; but in at least one of these they ought eventually to become competent as a result of their training.

Though it is easiest to illustrate in the vocational field, failure of this sort is not limited to purely vocational work. The non-vocational studies of the secondary school—English, mathematics, foreign language, and science, for example, for pupils who do not expect to use these subjects later in vocational or professional activities—are presumably taught in order that pupils may learn to do better certain things which it is socially desirable that they should do. The measure of each pupil's success in these subjects is that as a result of studying them he shall have acquired an ability to do something, and a habit of doing something, which it is worth while to society that he should possess. No such definite check as that available for the vocational subjects can be applied to the value of a pupil's accomplishment in purely general studies; the pupil is likely to be accepted as a member of society whether he gains much or little from his work. But the

pupil's success can nevertheless still be estimated. He has presumably gained some sort of habit or skill from his studies: has the gain been such as to make any important difference in the part that he now plays in society, or in the part that he will play after he leaves school? The answer to this question, as in the case of the corresponding test of success in vocational work, depends not on how hard the pupil has tried nor on how well he has "kept up," but on the eventual usefulness of his gain in an out-of-school environment. Unless the question can be answered in the affirmative, the pupil has failed in his work.

Much space has been given to the needs of irresponsible and failing pupils because at the present time, when the secondary school is in the throes of adapting itself to a more heterogeneous population than it has ever before attempted to educate, it is upon this group that attention centers. The school faces a sudden demand to evaluate its program for these pupils. It can do so intelligently only by establishing a criterion of success and failure in school work which will justly gauge the probability of profit from continued schooling in the case of any individual boy or girl. The definition of failure here proposed constitutes one important measure by which the school may recognize pupils who are likely to be more profitably occupied in some other type of activity than in mere prolongation of their school work.

The Establishment of Appropriate Standards in the Individual School. It is obvious that this measure cannot be successfully applied in the absence of defensible specific standards of achievement. The school administrator who is seriously concerned to acquaint himself with the actual progress his pupils are making is therefore confronted at the onset with the task of setting up such standards.

The task must clearly begin with a definition of the abilities and skills which each of the school's specialized curricula is designed to produce. The necessary definition of objectives is principally to be sought in an analysis of the out-of-school activities for which the curricula in question are intended to prepare. The objectives will differ to a degree from school to school and from time to time, as adult activities differ from one community to another, and as standards for the acceptable performance of these activities change. The task of setting up appropriate standards for vocational curricula has already been approached, however, through job-

analyses of various widely practiced occupations.¹⁵ A similar task has been attempted for general courses through the securing of a consensus of qualified opinion as to the non-vocational activities in which the competent American citizen should be able to engage.¹⁶ Completed studies of both these types, carried out by professional workers who have had exceptional resources at their disposal, provide an invaluable ground work for the establishment of soundly defensible school standards.

In the last analysis, however, the standards for any individual secondary school must be largely developed by that school's own staff. That this is the case is due not alone to the fact that standards formulated through intensive laboratory analysis have thus far included only a fraction of the activities for which the secondary school should prepare, though the limited scope of such standards represents an obvious defect. Nor is it due chiefly to the differences in the activities in which pupils in differently situated schools must be ready to engage, or to the changes which are slowly but constantly taking place in these activities, important though these variable factors are. The need for the local development of standards springs principally from the fact that the teachers who must apply them can be expected to put them into full effect only as they see the need for such standards and share in formulating them.

Hence the task of the school administrator in developing appropriate standards for his own school must be essentially that of stimulating his teachers to a detailed and careful thinking through of the particular types of competence for which their teaching should prepare. The administrator must aid his teachers to define such competence in terms of the socially valuable habits, abilities, and skills—not in terms of the mere facts acquired or even of the "insights" gained—which pupils should possess when they have completed their training. He must keep continually before himself and his staff, as the essential question which this definition of goals should help to answer, the question on which the whole issue of the continuance of any individual's education at public expense ought to depend: Will more schooling for this boy or girl be profitable both to the boy or girl concerned and to the community which is providing that schooling?

¹⁵See, for example, the various curriculum studies conducted and sponsored by Professor W. W. Charters of the Ohio State University.

¹⁶For an example of this type of analysis, see Franklin Bobbitt: *How to Make a Curriculum*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1924.

Lack of financial resources to support the detailed analyses which should be a part of this undertaking, and lack of preparation on the part of many teachers and administrative officers to carry out the work involved, will mean that few individual schools will be able to set up standards of pupil achievement which are in all respects satisfactory. The need for supplementing the efforts of separate schools through continued large-scale investigations is obvious. Yet even in the absence of such investigations, and despite the inevitable shortcomings of its own efforts, the individual school which attempts a serious attack on this problem can unquestionably do much to improve its work. For its teachers to become actively conscious of the desirability of subjecting the progress of their pupils to evaluation in terms of sound external criteria will in itself represent a forward step which relatively few schools have yet taken. For the school to have at its command even tentative criteria by which to gauge diminishing educational returns will mean an important addition to the school's ability to adjust its work to its pupils' individual needs.

IV. INDEFINITELY CONTINUED SCHOOLING IN THE LIGHT OF DIMINISHING EDUCATIONAL RETURNS

If the occurrence of diminishing educational returns can be detected within reasonable limits by school authorities, ought pupils to be permitted to remain in school after the level of diminishing returns has been reached?

Present Practice in American Secondary Schools. Most secondary schools at the present time, however clearly they may recognize the ineffectiveness of their work with certain types of pupils, seem to be making it their practice to retain all pupils in school as long as the pupils themselves see fit to attend. The schools' adoption of this policy has apparently rested on the assumption that in the upbringing of its boys and girls a democratic society has a two-fold function to perform. Democracy is concerned first of all with the education of these boys and girls—that is, with the development of whatever socially valuable abilities and characteristics may be appropriate both in general and in each individual case. Democracy is concerned also with the conservation of these abilities and characteristics once they have been developed. More specifically, a democratic society is concerned to guard against exploitation of the boys and girls whom it has edu-

cated, after their formal education has ended. America has thus far provided no social agency which is clearly responsible for this type of conservation, important though it is to the future of the nation. Under present industrial and economic conditions, the need for supervision of boys and girls who have left school is particularly acute. Rather than subject them to possible dangers arising from the absence of such supervision, school officials prefer to keep all boys and girls in school, where they may at least come to no harm, even though in certain cases no positive educational benefit is likely to result.

Valuable Outcomes of Present Practice. As an immediate expedient designed to meet a pressing immediate problem, this policy has much to commend it. Particularly is it to be commended where it has led to the enrichment and improvement of secondary-school offerings. This has been a noteworthy result in schools which, for instance, have sought better to meet the needs of certain of their pupils by extending the work-projects provided by 4-H Clubs and by the Smith-Hughes courses in agriculture, or which have followed the example of Carmel, New York, in inaugurating programs of apprenticeship under adults in the local community.¹⁷

Disadvantages of Making the Secondary School a Custodial Institution. In many schools, however, the policy has perforce led to the schools' introduction of what have been essentially "made-work" activities for many of their pupils: repairs and improvements in the buildings and grounds, construction of equipment, services in connection with the lunch-room, certain types of office work, and the like. In all these instances individual schools have illustrated valuable means of dealing with a problem which is both new and urgent. Yet it should be recognized that in so doing they have been serving not so much in the capacity of educational institutions as in that of custodial institutions.

As a long-time policy the plan of making the secondary school primarily a custodial institution for certain pupils is likely to have serious drawbacks. The school cannot effectively serve, for a number of important reasons, as an educational institution for pupils who are capable of putting their schooling to good effect, if at the same time it must assume the functions of a purely protective institution for boys and girls who are making no further educational progress.

¹⁷C. K. Taylor: "The Carmel Plan," *School Life*, XVIII:161-62 (May, 1933). M. K. Wischart: "A Boy's First Job," *Good Housekeeping*, 97:22-32. (October, 1933).

For the school to assume both these responsibilities at once would tend, in the first place, to leave untouched most of those pupils who can learn but who have no incentive for doing so. That these pupils lack any strong incentive arises in large measure from the fact that they have been allowed to regard school attendance as a right to be used or abused more or less at will, rather than as a privilege to be earned by honest effort and profitable achievement. They have done little or nothing "to earn their salt" educationally and still they have remained in school; they find that they can continue indefinitely under the same conditions; why should they try to progress educationally, when the advantages of school membership, from their point of view, can be had without the effort of learning? Formal adoption of the policy of allowing pupils to continue in school irrespective of achievement would only confirm such pupils in their attitude; it would in all probability, indeed, add many others to their present numbers.

By contrast, the need to earn the right to continue in school may in itself furnish an incentive to profitable achievement. Privately supported colleges and private vocational and technical schools have long been aware of this fact, and have acted on it. Public secondary schools which have set up tangible penalties for repeated failure (as in the case of the Baltimore schools, whose regulations were cited earlier) have in almost every instance convinced themselves of the strength and value of such an incentive. The school which assumes the prerogative of excluding pupils who do not show profitable educational accomplishments needs, of course, to exercise extreme caution in determining the criteria under which individual pupils are to be denied further school work. It needs also to use care to avoid slighting the needs of pupils to whom a traditional program is not well suited. But as the experience of numerous schools has already shown, just and discriminating use of exclusion in individual cases may greatly diminish the numbers of those pupils with whom most schools now find especial difficulty in dealing.

For the school to hold pupils indefinitely would tend, in the second place, to give a wholly false view of their own abilities and shortcomings to the pupils who had ceased to make progress in learning. For the sake of their own morale, such pupils could hardly be retained in regular classes and allowed to fail and go on failing. One of two courses would therefore have to be followed with them. Either they would

have to be assigned some type of work which got them substantially nowhere educationally, but which they could accomplish with at least a semblance of success; or they would have to be admitted to regular courses of study, in which their success would be measured almost solely in terms of their effort. Granting reasonable effort in either case, these pupils would find their work in school crowned with approval. The school could hardly make clear to them that the work they had done was merely "good, considering"; they would almost certainly conclude, as the experience of schools which have attempted this practice has shown, that their work was "good," without important qualification. Their disillusionment when they left the school would be inevitable. The school's announcement to these pupils that they had ceased to make progress and therefore could no longer profitably continue in school would not, of course, increase their abilities. It would at least fortify them for the standards which they would have to meet outside the school, however, by giving them a truer gauge of their own comparative strengths and weaknesses.

The policy of granting indefinite school membership to pupils whose continuance serves no clear educational purpose would tend, furthermore, to lessen the probability of effective work with those pupils for whom the school already knows how to make reasonably adequate provision. Pupils who cannot or will not learn constitute a more obvious and more pressing problem than pupils who can and will learn. The school would be rare indeed which could avoid giving primary attention to this problem. The result would be an inevitable slighting of the interests of those boys and girls for whom the school chiefly exists, in an effort to escape trouble from pupils for whom the school has already done the best it knows how to do.

Moreover, the distortion of their notions as to their own strengths and weaknesses on the part of pupils who were not progressing could hardly fail to be accompanied by a similar distortion of perspective on the part of abler pupils. Comparing their own accomplishment with that of the former group, the better pupils would be in constant danger of obtaining an exaggerated sense of superiority. By condoning the continuance in school of those whose presence involved little more than protracted busywork, the school would be making standards of real accomplishment difficult either to formulate or to apply. The result in the case of the abler

pupils would in all probability be both a failure to put forth their full effort on school tasks, and disillusionment not unlike that which would confront the less able, when they faced the severer competition of the world outside the school.

Finally, the attempt to serve two major functions at once would tend toward serious confusion in the minds of the supporting public with respect to the school's needs and accomplishments. The harmful results of such confusion in handicapping the school's performance of its educational functions have been clearly illustrated during the depression. A newspaper dispatch reporting public "exasperation with the alleged extravagance of the school executives" in a Western city emphasizes these results with unusual pointedness. "The real cause of friction," it says, "is the apparent inability of the school men to determine where education stops and social service begins. The school's budget includes provisions for health and dental clinics, an extensive library, playgrounds, kindergartens, investigation of indigent families, and evening courses at which the wives of prosperous business men learn to cook. These functions may be of tremendous value, but the people are not convinced . . ."¹⁸ Obviously the purely protective function which the school would be exercising if it allowed pupils to continue in school indefinitely would represent a phase not so much of education as of social service. However important this function may be, the school's primary task is to serve as an educational agency. It cannot afford to jeopardize its opportunity to perform this task by the assumption of duties not clearly within its province.

These various disadvantages, and no doubt others which cannot now be clearly foreseen, represent probable outcomes of any long-time attempt to make the secondary school responsible for the double function in question. The prediction that the outcomes described would result from any such attempt is based on more than pure surmise. Schools which are already trying to serve this double function have begun to show numerous traces of just these outcomes. Observation of the work of such schools, indeed, is no doubt chiefly responsible for much current criticism of secondary education. Particularly, it would seem to underline the concern expressed by those who fear the "water-logged condition" of the schools, and who suspect a lack of clear direction in the current educational program.

¹⁸"School Costs Irk Denver Taxpayers." *The New York Times*, Nov. 3, 1933.

A More Promising Means of Dealing with the Problem.

There are, fortunately, better means of supplying adequate protection and oversight for pupils who have ceased to profit by continued school work than simply keeping these pupils on in school. The best means of dealing with the problem—best from the standpoint both of the pupils directly affected and of those who should remain in school—would be to set up an agency, distinct from the secondary school but nevertheless an integral and respectable part of the state educational system, devoted to that special purpose. The establishment of such an agency would represent a thoroughly practical resolution of the difficulties which many individual schools are now attempting to meet through isolated and necessarily uncoordinated efforts. With some such agency in existence secondary schools in general could avoid the handicap of attempting to fulfill a double function, without at the same time ignoring the obvious needs of a considerable group of boys and girls. Once such an agency was established, schools could both justly and wisely adopt the policy of directing into more appropriate forms of activity pupils whose continued school work promised no profitable return.

V. THE NEED FOR A NEW BRANCH OF THE STATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM TO SUPPLEMENT THE PROGRAM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

The need for a supervisory agency supplementing the secondary school is acute. Social changes have brought the United States to a place at which the conservation of youth can no longer be left to random effort or to individual initiative. As a state function no less important than the function of education, the conservation of educational gains must be definitely and systematically provided for. And the fact that the schools cannot undertake the necessary conservation without seriously impairing their educational efficiency leaves no wise course open but to establish some separate organization specially entrusted with the task.

European Parallels to the Present American Problem.

The need for some such organization has already been recognized in a number of European countries. Social and economic conditions in Bulgaria, Holland, Switzerland, and Germany produced several years ago the problem which is only now becoming serious in the United States—that of providing suitable activities for young people who have completed their

formal schooling, but who cannot immediately be absorbed into vocational employment. Detailed plans for meeting the problem have differed in these various countries, but its solution has been attempted along the same broad lines. The plans have involved the establishment of work camps, in which both boys and girls of the group in question may voluntarily enroll.¹⁹ The projects undertaken in these camps have been of a type which promote the general welfare. Undertakings reported as typical of the German camps include the construction of roads and trails, the draining of marshes, meadows, and forest lands, and flood control work on a small scale.²⁰ At the same time the projects have been such as not to compete with the activities of regularly employed adults. The boys and girls enrolled have been paid for their work a wage large enough to allow them to keep their self-respect as paid employees, but too small to deter them from accepting regular employment when the latter might become open to them. In certain instances the camps have been associated with governmental employment agencies, which have assumed responsibility for placing the camp members in regular employment as rapidly as openings became available.

The Proper Functions of a Supervisory Agency for American boys and girls. Any American parallel to these European undertakings ought to envisage a broader field of responsibility and a greater variety of activities than the European camps involve. Though the work being done by the present Civilian Conservation Corps approximates one type of work which might properly be undertaken by the needed protective agency, it represents only a small part of that work. The Civilian Conservation Corps entirely neglects girls, and gives employment to boys only on "made" work, under a military regime. The major responsibility of adequate protective agencies should be for supervision of the employment of boys and girls both, not in regimented camps but in or near the communities in which they live. The agencies responsible for this supervision need not be as numerous as the secondary schools whose work they are designed to supplement, since for economy they will need to draw boys and girls from many schools. They may accordingly be better organized on a state-wide basis than under the auspices of local school sys-

¹⁹For brief accounts of such camps see W. F. Russell: *Schools of Bulgaria*, (Teachers College, Columbia University, 1924) p. 96; and Kenneth Holland: "Work Camps for the Youth of Germany," *School and Society*, XXXIX, 999:213-15 (Feb. 17, 1934). The issue of the *Junior-Senior High-School Clearing House* for November, 1935, presents a series of articles dealing with both European and American undertakings of this type.

²⁰Kenneth Holland, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

tems; and they can be more effectively administered under the control of the state departments of education than as branches of the Federal government. Though their detailed features can hardly be worked out except through careful experimentation, certain characteristics which they should possess can be foreseen in advance.

Each such agency should assume responsibility for the oversight of every boy and girl within its territory who has ceased to profit by continued school work but has not yet obtained regular employment. Its oversight should begin with an accurate census of all boys and girls subject to its care. Supervision may be provided in part through the enrollment of boys and girls in centralized work camps, as under the Civilian Conservation Corps. There are many boys, however, and there are even more girls, who can be quite as profitably occupied at home or under an occasional vocational apprenticeship system as in special camps. Such boys and girls should be encouraged to engage in whatever activities seem most appropriate under the circumstances. Oversight of their choice of activities and general supervision of their work should be as much a responsibility of the agency in question as should supervision of the activities of members of the specially organized camps.

For boys and girls who cannot on their own account find useful work to do, each such agency should provide appropriate work. The work should be both socially valuable and of a kind which does not compete with the activities of regularly employed adults; it should be work, that is to say, which society would like to have done, but which society would not pay to have done except that its cost would secure the wholesome employment of boys and girls otherwise unemployed as well as the performance of the work itself. The work should, moreover, be such as to allow each boy and girl to make use of whatever special abilities and skills his previous education may have given him. It may in part be work or apprenticeship of the type suggested as an appropriate supplement to the usual school activities; in part it will need to be especially designed to meet particular needs and particular circumstances.

Boys and girls employed on such work should be paid a regular wage, substantially lower than that paid locally to adults, but large enough to represent a tangible return for the service rendered. Wages should probably be graduated according to the type of work performed and according to

the workers' success in performing it. Transfer from the secondary school to out-of-school work should mean, in the minds of the boys and girls concerned, much the same thing that leaving school to take a job has meant in the past. Both the nature of the work provided and so far as possible the conditions under which it is done should contribute to this end.

In connection with the work there should be systematic effort to provide for boys and girls a kind of learning through experience which the formal school cannot effectively offer. Out-of-school work can only occasionally be a sound educational *substitute for the school*; it can often, however, be a valuable educational *supplement to the school*. In its provision for the practical use of abilities gained in school, in its emphasis on the value of such abilities, and in the opportunities which it may offer for the incidental extension of pupils' knowledge, it can in particular do much to further as well as to conserve the educational development of each boy and girl who engages in it under competent supervision.

Each supervisory agency should at all times be ready to recommend for readmittance to the secondary school boys and girls whose out-of-school experience has made it probable that they will profit by a resumption of formal school work. To the extent that these agencies are themselves successful in demonstrating the value of continued schooling, there will be many such boys and girls to recommend. Especially with pupils who have been excluded from school because of their lack of desire to learn rather than for want of ability to learn, the supervisory agency should be alert to recognize and encourage any change of attitude toward further education.

Though these agencies should be administered as organizations distinct from the formal secondary school, they should work in the closest possible harmony with the public schools. Records of pupils' school activities should either be forwarded to the supervisory agencies by the schools from which individual pupils come, or should be made easily accessible to these agencies. The latter can maintain the most effective relationships with the schools if they are organized and administered as integral parts of the state educational system. Although, for reasons which have already been suggested, their budgets should be clearly distinguished from those of the schools, as organizations directly supplementing the schools, they should be so set up as to promote the adoption of thoroughly consistent policies.

This brief description of a type of agency which would attempt to meet the pressing need for protection of adolescent boys and girls obviously does not cover all the possible activities of such agencies, nor does it deal with all the problems which would have to be faced. In addition to their relationship with the public schools, agencies of this kind might profitably establish coöperative relationships with industry, both for the purpose of securing apprenticeship opportunities for boys and girls and as a means of placing suitably trained young people in employment. Important problems which these agencies would have to face would include questions of whether to segregate boys and girls who were employed on group work, of how to provide wholesome leisure activities for members of work camps, of how far to exercise compulsion in the supervisory program, of how to make the oversight of the boys and girls engaged in individual work thoroughly effective. Matters such as these would in all probability have to be dealt with in different ways under differing conditions, until continued experimentation demonstrated the value of particular types of practice.

Yet the need for agencies of this sort, and the service which they could render, are so great as to make their eventual development imperative. Their primary value would be in supplying for American boys and girls a type of supervised occupation now almost entirely neglected, for lack of which thousands of young people are living in demoralizing idleness on what their parents can earn, or beating their way as hoboes about the country,²¹ or keeping themselves alive on the bounty of organized charity. From the narrower standpoint of the educational issue here discussed, these agencies would seem to provide the only means by which a democratic program of secondary education can be both economically and effectively administered. They represent, indeed, the only thoroughly practical solution to the problem of safeguarding the educational accomplishments of the schools, and at the same time offering adequate protection for boys and girls for whom further schooling offers no adequate promise of educational benefit.

Can the United States Afford to Provide Supervision for Unemployed Boys and Girls Who Are Not in School? Chief

²¹Thomas Minchan, in *Boy and Girl Tramps of America* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1934), reports an extensive and painstaking study of hundreds of the "wild children" of the United States. He advocates (p. 236) a Child Conservation Corps "which will have as its purpose the saving not of our forests a hundred years from to-day, but of our boys and girls growing into the men and women of to-morrow."

objection to the establishment of such agencies as these is likely to be based on their cost. That they will add to the direct expense to which the State has been put in the past in caring for its boys and girls is clear. Just how great the added expense will be can hardly be determined short of actual trial. There are various factors, however, which make it seem probable that the cost will be much less than might at first be supposed.

For one thing, a considerable part of the cost will consist not of added expense, but of expense which the schools are now forced to bear. The existence of the proposed agencies will make it possible to transfer from the schools boys and girls not profiting from school work, who are nevertheless being offered supervision and protection under the schools' budgets. The lessening of school expenses on account of the removal of these boys and girls will represent an item to be deducted from whatever new expense the protective agencies may create.

Furthermore, not all the boys and girls to be provided for by the new agencies—probably not even a majority of them—will need to be supplied at public expense with "made" work. For many young people the supervision of work done at home or in situations of their own making will represent the extent of the agencies responsibility. The added expense involved in supervision of this type will be notably less than that for "made" work, especially where the latter requires the concentration of workers in camps.

Again, whatever "made" work is provided may in itself be expected to yield a tangible return for the money expended for it. Unlike the occupations through which pupils are commonly supplied with busywork in the schools, the activities of boys and girls employed under the proposed agencies should produce results of positive use to society. The value of these products will represent a further item to be deducted from the expense of the protective organization.

All these considerations suggest that the cost of supporting such agencies will be less than would the cost of providing through the schools for the boys and girls of whom these agencies would take charge. The urgent demands of parents, coupled with America's apparent commitment to a program of practically universal secondary education, are now forcing these boys and girls upon the schools. To oppose protective agencies on the ground of their cost when such agencies can fulfill a necessary function both better and more

economically than the schools can fulfill it would represent an extreme of shortsightedness.

That the United States cannot escape this cost in one form or another is becoming increasingly evident. The economic idleness with which adolescent boys and girls are now being confronted presents dangers to the nation as a whole which cannot safely be ignored. If boys and girls are left to their own devices in the face of this idleness, thousands of them are bound to use it in such a way that society will be forced to pay the bill later through the provision of penal institutions and asylums. The cost of conserving the wholesome attitudes and the useful skills and understandings which the schools have developed will be less than the cost of repairing the evil conditions which neglect of these gains will create. As has been emphasized earlier, the question which now confronts America is not so much whether the nation can afford to provide education and protection for all its young people, as whether the nation can afford not to do so.

The Resolution of the Issue. The analysis presented in the foregoing pages no doubt suggests clearly enough the appropriate resolution of the issue with which this discussion is concerned. For the sake of emphasis, the answer to the question involved in that issue deserves more explicit statement. The answer may be summarized as follows:

American secondary schools now enroll, and failing definite action on the part of school authorities will continue to enroll, boys and girls for whom some form of out-of-school experience promises to be of greater value than continued schooling. Effective arrangements can at present seldom be made for these boys and girls, because of the absence of any social agency, except the school, which can afford extensive supervision and protection to adolescents. The need of a non-school agency which will assume responsibility for the oversight of adolescents who are not in school is urgent. As soon as such an agency can be established, school authorities should assume responsibility for transferring to its supervision all pupils whose needs are likely to be better served by out-of-school activities than by continued schooling.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that school people owe it to themselves and to their profession to take the lead in bringing about the establishment of this new institution. In some form or other the needs of unemployed adolescents are going to be provided for. But without a more active and

imaginative attack on the problem than the great majority of schools have shown during the past five years, these needs are going to be met through programs sponsored and directed by someone else than educators. A National Youth Administration directed by laymen and political office-holders is better than no systematic provision for youth at all. The best possible provision for youth can be made, however, only through the active support by school people as a group, of a program which recognizes and uses all the insight, imagination, and experience that the professional background of teachers and school administrators affords. Whether school people have enough ingenuity and initiative to assume positive leadership in such a program—this is a question to which school people themselves must give the answer. The answer will be in the highest degree discreditable to them as professional workers if it consists of explanations that no consistent program is possible, or of complaints that details in the needed program have not yet been filled in, or of pleas for authorization and guidance from some outside source. The answer will be professionally respectable only as it takes the form of positive, widespread, and imaginative action, initiated and directed by educators as a professional group.

VI. A PRACTICABLE PROGRAM

The desirability of a definite program under which certain secondary-school pupils may be transferred to the care of other agencies better adapted to their educational needs is very recent, and has not yet penetrated the popular consciousness. Social conditions calling for the systematic supervision of large numbers of young people who have left school are also of comparatively recent origin. Hence the recommendation that agencies be established to provide this supervision, and that all pupils be transferred to their care who have ceased to profit from school work, must be widely disseminated and strongly presented if it is to win favor with those who support the schools.

Because the establishment of such agencies depends upon a degree of public interest and concern which has not yet been aroused, most schools will find themselves limited in the measures they can immediately adopt toward putting the recommended program into effect. The progress which individual schools can make will vary widely. No school can afford to ignore the problems here presented. The children

of the depression are here to deal with. Few schools are so hedged about that they can do nothing about the problems of these boys and girls; many schools, though they cannot independently reach a wholly adequate solution, will be able to initiate numerous valuable procedures. Hence there are here suggested certain measures which schools as institutions and which school officials as individuals may profitably undertake, while at the same time they endeavor to secure general public acceptance of the program as a whole.

As in the case of the measures proposed for the general extension of secondary education, the measures here listed are composed in part of undertakings suggested for individual schools, in part of undertakings demanding coöperative action by groups of schools and school officials.

A Program for the Individual School. The individual secondary school should endeavor:

1. *To arrive at a usable definition of the tool skills and the social understandings which are essential to any individual as a means of "getting along" outside the school, and to see that every pupil has acquired these minimum essentials before he is permitted to leave school.* Because of the recent notable increase in the persistence of pupils in school attendance, the effort of the public school to assure mastery of the minimum essentials by all boys and girls is accompanied with far less difficulty now than has ever previously been the case. Recent changes in the degrees and types of skill and understanding which constitute minimum essentials make desirable, however, a re-definition of these necessary fundamental abilities. The elementary school does not always insist on mastery of the minimum essentials by the pupils whom it promotes to the secondary school; nor should it be expected always to do so. The secondary school cannot afford to exclude pupils, or to allow pupils to leave school, who have not acquired these essentials. Hence the secondary school must in large measure take on itself responsibility for defining the essentials and for insuring their mastery by its pupils.

2. *To incorporate in its program as many types of differentiated training as promise at the same time a profitable return to society and a means of meeting the varied interests, needs, and abilities of secondary-school pupils.* Beyond whatever training it needs to give in the minimum essentials, the secondary school must provide for the development of specialized abilities of numerous types. Present conditions make

profitable to a democratic society the development of competence at the secondary-school level in a variety of fields, many of which represent a departure from the traditionally academic. To meet the varied interests and abilities of its pupils, the individual secondary school should therefore go as far as its resources permit in broadening its offerings to include non-academic as well as highly intellectual types of training. It should give special attention to devising and supervising out-of-school projects which will provide sound educational opportunities for boys and girls who are not fully profiting from the established curriculum. The school which is forced by financial restrictions to offer a limited program may well add new major differentiations to meet the needs of major groups of its pupils before it elaborates its offerings for pupils for whom minimal programs have already been provided. Neither justice to its individual pupils nor its responsibility for an adequate return to the society which it serves will allow the secondary school to restrict its program to one or two types of training addressed to the interests of a small group.

3. *To draw up, in connection with each major division of its instructional program, a list of the habits, abilities, and skills which that division of the program should develop in the pupils who pursue it.* The return which both society and the individual seek from public secondary education consists in the development of socially valuable competence in various fields. This competence the school can best define for each field in terms of the specific habits, abilities, and skills of which competence in that field is composed. The desired outcomes of each part of the school's program must be thus defined before the school can obtain either a clear view of its own goals or a sound measure of its achievements. In arriving at its own definition of outcomes the individual school will find technical job-analyses and various current lists of the general abilities which should be possessed by the good citizen of unmistakable value. The individual school must be prepared, however, both to supplement these lists in numerous respects and to modify them as may be necessary in the light of its own analyses of local needs.

4. *To set up a program of evaluation by which progress toward each of the important objectives of the school may be reliably measured.* Given a clear definition of the various types of socially valuable competence which the school is seeking to develop, it should be possible to state what changes in

behavior the development of such competence must involve. Whether this behavior is in the realm of action or of ideas, it can be stated in terms of definite changes which the school is attempting to bring about. Once this is done, it is possible to foresee in what situations such behavior may be observed. If the desired behavior consists of changes in the pupil's ideas, it may be observed in paper-and-pencil test situations. If it consists of changes in attitude it may be observed in the pupil's comments, writing or other creative expression. If it consists of changes in "overt" behavior, it may best be observed in directed observation of the pupil at work or at play. Though the easiest measure to use is that afforded by the pencil-and-paper test, the school which attempts to think through its objectives will quickly realize how few forms of socially valuable competence—seldom more than the recall of factual information and a few types of problem-solving ability—can be measured by such means alone.

Through careful records of its pupils' responses in a variety of appropriate test situations, the secondary school needs to determine how much year-to-year growth a pupil should show who gives promise of attaining competence in a given field as a result of a reasonable total period of instruction in that field. Few appropriate measures of growth are now available. Hence the individual school must of necessity devise such measures for itself on the basis of its own observation and experiment. The development of these measures need not mean the establishment of a rigorously inflexible course of study in any field; it may, and should, allow for variations in the nature of achievement from one pupil to another or from one class to another. The necessary measures ought, however, to be such as to indicate appropriate *amounts* of progress, and desirable *directions* of progress, in the normal pupil's year-by-year growth toward a developed competence.

5. *To establish a plan of guidance by which each pupil may be aided to choose as a basis for his work that part of the school's program which is at the same time best adapted to his interests and abilities and most likely to yield a socially valuable return in his individual case.* The need for a scheme of guidance by which pupils may be aided to make a wise choice of their educational programs has been so often presented as to demand no special defense in this connection. One point only need be explicitly noted—that whereas the desirability of systematic guidance is commonly argued from the standpoint of

the individual pupil, a carefully administered program of guidance is of no less importance from the standpoint of the economy with which the school makes its educational return to society. In the absence of such a program, the resultant waste from mistaken choices and misdirected efforts must necessarily greatly diminish the school's efficiency.

6. *To establish a plan of guidance by which, also, each pupil may be helped to gain the fullest possible benefit from whatever part of the school program he may be pursuing.* The need for guidance which will aid each pupil to adapt himself as fully as possible to the educational requirements appropriately made of him—and which, by the same token, will lead to appropriate variations in those requirements to meet individual needs—is no less apparent than the need for guidance which has pupil distribution as its chief function. Guidance which emphasizes pupil adaptation should take into account each pupil's progress both in relation to that of his group and in relation to his own ability. It should lead to whatever adjustments in subject matter or teaching methods are necessary to make each pupil's achievement satisfactory in both these respects—though always with the proviso that these adjustments must be in harmony with the standards of competence which the school must maintain if it is to fulfill its social obligations. Adaptive guidance is as properly a part of the secondary-school guidance program as is guidance from the standpoint of distribution; but since the latter type of guidance is frequently provided in schools which give no adequate place to the former, the two types deserve, for the sake of emphasis at least, to be separately listed.

7. *To scrutinize periodically, in the case of each of its pupils, the likelihood that continued schooling will result in both individual and social benefit.* Given a clear definition of its aims in terms of various forms of socially valuable competence, and given reasonably adequate measures of each pupil's progress toward the achievement of such competence, the secondary school will have means of judging the probable effectiveness of continued schooling in each individual case. A pupil's successful progress in the work in which he has been engaged may fairly be held to entitle him to continue in that work. A pupil's failure to meet minimum standards of progress toward competence should make him subject to careful attention by school officials. If repetition of his failure seems probable, he cannot properly be allowed to continue in the work

in which he has failed. Adequate guidance may lead a failing pupil to substitute a more promising program for that in which he has been unsuccessful; if so, the school need resort to no authoritative action. If, however, a failing pupil refuses to abandon of his own accord a program in which he gives no appreciable promise of success, the school has both the right and the obligation to deny him further opportunity to pursue that program.

8. *To direct pupils who may no longer be profiting by such work as the school can offer into other types of education or into employment, when either of these courses is feasible.* Pupils who have failed in the specialized programs which they have elected should be given full opportunity to demonstrate their ability in such other types of work as the school may be able to provide. Pupils who have shown through actual trial, however, that they are unable or unwilling to deal successfully with any of the differentiated programs which the school can profitably offer them, should be directed whenever possible—authoritatively, if need be—into other types of activity. If more promising educational opportunities outside the school in question are open to these pupils, whether in the form of a different type of schooling elsewhere or through vocational apprenticeship, the pupils may legitimately be excluded from the school in which they are failing. In the absence of opportunities for further education, the opportunity to obtain suitable employment may furnish adequate ground for exclusion. In no case, however, should a pupil be excluded without definite effort on the part of the school officials to see that both the pupil and his parents understand the basis for the school's action and recognize its implications.

9. *To direct its abler pupils also into out-of-school activities when these activities promise greater educational advantage than does continued schooling.* The question of how long it is good for a given boy or girl to stay in the secondary school must in every case be answered in terms of relative values. For able pupils the value of non-school activities which conflict with school work is not often likely to outweigh the advantages of continued schooling. Yet even pupils who are succeeding in school may occasionally find it to their advantage to substitute other types of activity for all or for a part of the usual program of schooling. If the out-of-school activities open to a given boy or girl seem, when considered on their individual merits, to hold real possibilities for educational growth, the

secondary school should not hesitate to advise the pupil accordingly. In some cases the school may properly curtail a pupil's program, so that he is spending less time than the average in formal school work; in other cases it may interrupt his school program altogether, in order to allow him to undertake work which will be educationally of greater value.

A Program Demanding Coöperative Action by Groups of Schools and School Officials. Beyond the undertaking which should form part of the program of the individual secondary school, coöperative action by groups of schools and school officials will be necessary:

1. *To re-define the abilities and understandings which should constitute the minimum essentials of public education, through more exact and comprehensive investigations than are possible in the individual school.* It has already been pointed out that changes both in social conditions and in the relationship between the elementary and secondary schools have lessened the value of existing definitions of the minimum essentials of education. The individual secondary school must necessarily, however, arrive at some working definition of these minimum essentials as a basis for its own program. Lack of resources which will permit full and exact investigation of social needs is likely to make inaccurate and possibly invalid any such definition formulated independently by a single school. Coöperative action which will provide support for large-scale investigations offers the only effective means of readjusting an important part of the educational program to current requirements.

2. *Through carefully conducted investigations of the activities of competent adults, to define competence in the various activities for which the secondary school should prepare.* The establishment of valid goals for the specialized instruction offered in the secondary school, like the re-definition of minimum essentials, comprises a task too complex for the resources of any single school. More or less exacting listing of the habits and skills which go to make up competence in special fields is imperative, however, if secondary schools in general are to have any reliable gauge of the social value of their work. Lists of desirable habits and skills do not in themselves constitute a curriculum for the school, but as a statement of the outcomes to be expected of an economically and effectively administered curriculum they represent an essential element in curriculum-

in which he has failed. Adequate guidance may lead a failing pupil to substitute a more promising program for that in which he has been unsuccessful; if so, the school need resort to no authoritative action. If, however, a failing pupil refuses to abandon of his own accord a program in which he gives no appreciable promise of success, the school has both the right and the obligation to deny him further opportunity to pursue that program.

8. *To direct pupils who may no longer be profiting by such work as the school can offer into other types of education or into employment, when either of these courses is feasible.* Pupils who have failed in the specialized programs which they have elected should be given full opportunity to demonstrate their ability in such other types of work as the school may be able to provide. Pupils who have shown through actual trial, however, that they are unable or unwilling to deal successfully with any of the differentiated programs which the school can profitably offer them, should be directed whenever possible—authoritatively, if need be—into other types of activity. If more promising educational opportunities outside the school in question are open to these pupils, whether in the form of a different type of schooling elsewhere or through vocational apprenticeship, the pupils may legitimately be excluded from the school in which they are failing. In the absence of opportunities for further education, the opportunity to obtain suitable employment may furnish adequate ground for exclusion. In no case, however, should a pupil be excluded without definite effort on the part of the school officials to see that both the pupil and his parents understand the basis for the school's action and recognize its implications.

9. *To direct its abler pupils also into out-of-school activities when these activities promise greater educational advantage than does continued schooling.* The question of how long it is good for a given boy or girl to stay in the secondary school must in every case be answered in terms of relative values. For able pupils the value of non-school activities which conflict with school work is not often likely to outweigh the advantages of continued schooling. Yet even pupils who are succeeding in school may occasionally find it to their advantage to substitute other types of activity for all or for a part of the usual program of schooling. If the out-of-school activities open to a given boy or girl seem, when considered on their individual merits, to hold real possibilities for educational growth, the

secondary school should not hesitate to advise the pupil accordingly. In some cases the school may properly curtail a pupil's program, so that he is spending less time than the average in formal school work; in other cases it may interrupt his school program altogether, in order to allow him to undertake work which will be educationally of greater value.

A Program Demanding Coöperative Action by Groups of Schools and School Officials. Beyond the undertaking which should form part of the program of the individual secondary school, coöperative action by groups of schools and school officials will be necessary:

1. *To re-define the abilities and understandings which should constitute the minimum essentials of public education, through more exact and comprehensive investigations than are possible in the individual school.* It has already been pointed out that changes both in social conditions and in the relationship between the elementary and secondary schools have lessened the value of existing definitions of the minimum essentials of education. The individual secondary school must necessarily, however, arrive at some working definition of these minimum essentials as a basis for its own program. Lack of resources which will permit full and exact investigation of social needs is likely to make inaccurate and possibly invalid any such definition formulated independently by a single school. Coöperative action which will provide support for large-scale investigations offers the only effective means of readjusting an important part of the educational program to current requirements.

2. *Through carefully conducted investigations of the activities of competent adults, to define competence in the various activities for which the secondary school should prepare.* The establishment of valid goals for the specialized instruction offered in the secondary school, like the re-definition of minimum essentials, comprises a task too complex for the resources of any single school. More or less exacting listing of the habits and skills which go to make up competence in special fields is imperative, however, if secondary schools in general are to have any reliable gauge of the social value of their work. Lists of desirable habits and skills do not in themselves constitute a curriculum for the school, but as a statement of the outcomes to be expected of an economically and effectively administered curriculum they represent an essential element in curriculum-

making and curriculum-improvement. Failure to address the work of the secondary school to goals defined on this basis has indubitably resulted in the past in great waste of educational effort. The technique for defining such goals and for making them the basis of the secondary-school curriculum is already well developed. The present need for economy in secondary education suggests that this technique be used to the full, and that every necessary means be taken to incorporate its results as completely and as speedily as possible in the curricula of secondary schools throughout the nation.

3. *To stimulate and coördinate experimentation in individual schools as a means of determining reasonable minimum stages of growth toward competence in various specialized fields.* An essential supplement to the definition of the specific habits and skills to be developed in the secondary school is the determination of the minimum amount of growth toward competence which can reasonably be expected in each pupil's year-by-year progress. Such growth will obviously be dependent in principal measure on the subject-matter and the methods of teaching employed. Extensive experimentation to determine optimum methods and materials is impossible in any single school. Experimentation of this sort is highly necessary, however, if school work is to be conducted at its maximum possible efficiency. It can best be accomplished through the joint efforts of many schools, working together under a scheme of coöperation which will insure adoption of uniform goals, due coördination of effort, and careful interpretation of results.

4. *To stimulate and coördinate experimentation in the development of new types of differentiation in the secondary-school program.* Lacking concerted effort to devise new types of differentiation in the secondary school, to test these new types, and to discover methods of organizing them effectively, the program of secondary education is destined to lag far behind changes in educational needs. Efforts to adapt the school program to the needs of pupils on the one hand and of society on the other have for the most part sprung thus far from the uncoördinated initiative of individual schools and individual professional workers. Productive though many of these efforts have been, their value has too often been lost because they have been sporadic and unsystematic. Few undertakings could be of greater service to the improvement of secondary education in America than the establishment of an organization to stimulate and direct such efforts, to provide the supple-

mentary financial support which would often be needed to make them maximally effective, and to disseminate information as to their results in such manner as to make those results bear fruit in all the schools of the nation rather than in merely a selected few.

5. *To promote the further development, and the validation, of techniques of guidance.* The development of methods of pupil guidance has progressed sufficiently far to indicate the value of such methods in general both in meeting the needs of individual pupils and in adding to the economy and effectiveness with which the secondary-school program is administered. Not enough experimentation has thus far been conducted, however, to establish the relative values of various specific methods and materials commonly used in guidance; nor have plans of guidance been developed which can be administered with complete effectiveness in small schools. Large-scale investigations of both these problems can contribute greatly to the elimination of waste and the increase of efficiency in the secondary-school program.

6. *To promote comprehensive and systematic arrangements for the supervision and protection by a new branch of the state educational system, of boys and girls for whom continued schooling offers no adequate promise of individual and social return.* The secondary school is now faced with the demand that it divide its energies between two groups of boys and girls. On the one hand, it must provide for the education of an ever-increasing number of pupils who are progressing successfully in their school work. On the other hand, it is being forced to offer supervision to numerous unemployed boys and girls who are unable or unwilling to make profitable use of continued schooling. The school cannot be expected to do full justice to both these tasks at once. Yet there exists at present no social agency except the school which is in a position to care systematically for the latter group of young people. Current social conditions suggest that this group will be a permanent one, and that its problems are likely to become increasingly acute. Protection and supervision for the boys and girls who compose this group are essential, not merely for the well-being of the boys and girls themselves but for the fundamental security of the state. The needed protection and supervision can best be afforded through some centralized educational agency, distinct from the secondary school but working in complete harmony with the school. Such an agency can

probably be most economically and effectively administered in each state under the auspices of the state department of education. In view of the pressure under which the secondary school is now being put to assume a protective function which it is ill-equipped to undertake, the need for a special organization particularly charged with exercising this function is so acute as to demand the united action of school officials to the end that such an organization may be speedily established.

ISSUE III

Shall secondary education be concerned only with the welfare and progress of the individual, or with these only as they promise to contribute to the welfare and progress of society?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

Many believe that between the highest good of the individual and the highest good of society there exists a perfect harmony which it is the purpose of education to seek. Nevertheless, until all conflicts between the individual and society end in the happy fulfillment of this aim, a very real issue in education persists. Shall an individual's narrowly conceived or purely personal interests take precedence over his social responsibilities and jeopardize the welfare of his group, or shall appeal be made to a higher principle to re-direct him toward that harmony of interests which education ought to serve?

The issue has been intensifying ever since it became evident that the historic American tradition of individualism was no longer a sufficient philosophy to guide men through the social and economic transformations of the century. In a world of growing interdependence, man's irrepressible longing for a more abundant life places increasing emphasis upon the collective action necessary to attain it, demands a new discipline, and calls for an education directed toward the common good. While individualism still has a role to play, education now aims at a greater socialization of boys and girls than ever before.

In times past, processes of socialization have brought personal desires in conflict with group aims. We may now expect such conflicts to increase, and we shall need some new principle to resolve them. Such a principle for education may be found in the social and civic view of education suggested in the statement that "the State maintains free public education to perpetuate itself and to promote its own interests." A similar principle is stated or implied in the educational policies of other nations, particularly in Europe, but in America educators have been slow to seize upon it as the foundation of their school policy and their proposals for public support.

The American tradition of individualism is still militant enough to devise objections to the revision of education which a thorough application of the principle of state-investment would require, and its opposition will be further aided by the fact that the bulk of the educational profession are at present unprepared to inaugurate and defend a school program based upon a social view of its purpose. But the circumstances of modern life are pressing the new point of view irresistably upon us. Eventually, both school people and public must accept it. Let school people be the first.

When a social view of education is generally accepted, educators will find that they have new responsibilities and face new problems. They will be obligated to a calm acceptance and espousal of the democratic ideal as the controlling principle of our society. They will need to define the major goals of American life and direct to their attainment the wills of all American boys and girls, providing them with whatever means education can offer for putting intentions into good effect. With this responsibility also comes the problem, implied in the Issue, of checking deviations from the major patterns of society.

Educators must also earnestly feel their responsibility for producing dividends on "the great investment" in the ways of a better informed and more active electorate, a better organization and spirit of community life, and a gradual elevation of man's vocational activities and his economic well-being. And this in turn demands a significant curriculum revision based upon a social view of education, as well as a reformation in the training and selection of teachers to provide schools with faculties who view their work in terms of its social consequences. And finally, educators must settle all practical problems involving the pupil and the provisions made for his welfare on the basis that what the school does for him must eventuate in abilities which he will exercise in liquidating his obligation to the State.

I. THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

John Dewey has often argued that no issue exists between the welfare and progress of the individual and the welfare and progress of society. "*Social* cannot be opposed in fact or in idea to *individual*. Society is individuals-in-their-relations.

An individual apart from social relations is a myth—or a monstrosity.”¹

The issue is, indeed, like a window in a school building. First we approach it from the outside, from the point of view of society. We look in at the children, hoping that they will be educated to join our quest for the values we cherish. We do this, perhaps, with a double motive. We know that their participation is necessary if our civilization is to continue; we also know that their participation is necessary if they are to win for themselves the values which they, as members of our society, will cherish also. Then, being educators, we are privileged to step inside and look through the window from the point of view of the individuals who are being educated. Again we wish them to be educated to join the quest of society for the values which it is seeking. Why? Because they are members of our society and will come to desire the same values which our society collectively is seeking, and they can win these values only through social coöperation. The day is past when a man can provide for himself. Now his goals are group goals, to be reached only through united effort.

Under this broad interpretation, the welfare and progress of the individual is practically synonymous with the welfare and progress of society. We know, however, that such a broad interpretation is seldom put upon the welfare and progress of the individual in the practical conduct of school affairs. The issue is raised by the fact that individuals do not always cherish the values which society is seeking, nor do they realize that such values as they cherish must be attained through social coöperation. They have to learn to cherish these values through the processes of education, and they must be disciplined to coöperate with their fellows in order to attain them. While their education is incomplete, they may wish to pursue some goal which is detrimental to the welfare and progress of society, or they may elect to pursue a worthy goal in an anti-social manner. In such cases it is not only futile; it is philosophically unsound to argue with the individual that his own goals are being thwarted by his anti-social conduct. He has not yet come to accept these goals as his own, and a long process of education is before him until he does. At the moment, his interests and the interests of society are opposed. It is in such instances that we inquire whether the school is bound to

¹John Dewey: *The Educational Frontier*, p. 291. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1933.

uphold the interests of society when they conflict with the interests of an incompletely socialized individual.

That the issue is real *in practice* and must be met honestly and vigorously cannot be denied. It is raised repeatedly in the course of the day's work in every high school in the country. It is raised by parents who demand of the State opportunities for the education of their children which they would not provide themselves, even if they were able to do so. It is raised by pupils who demand specialized work in the school to the exclusion of other work which is designed to promote social coöperation, and who insist that the school authorities have no right to hold them to requirements which are in conflict with the course they wish to pursue. It is raised whenever the school is regarded as a place where an individual is trained as he wishes to be trained, for a purpose which he alone decides is good. It is raised whenever pupils do not apply themselves diligently to a soundly conceived program of education, and either fail the course or are passed with little or no increase in power.

The issue is also raised by the ill-advised and unjustifiable programs of so many of our high schools. Even a cursory examination of the courses of study in the average high school in our country reveals the fact that those who are responsible for making and administering these courses of study have not seriously considered how they will ever lead individuals to accept the values which our society cherishes and to pursue them effectively through social coöperation. All too often courses are in the program as a result of mere academic tradition or at the insistence of selfish, individual groups. If the schools are provided by society, they should be able to prove that they have accomplished the purposes for which they were provided.

II. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Our Tradition of Individualism. The experience of the American people up to the present has tended to establish and confirm the tradition of individualism. The country was settled by individualists who were dissatisfied with conditions at home and who wished for opportunities for advancement that could be won by individual effort. The government was generous in its requirements for the preëmption of land, and a virgin continent with seemingly unlimited resources confirmed the original impulses of the person who wished to make his way alone and to possess in his own right.

America became the land of opportunity, a fabled land where the common man without possessions but with courage, resourcefulness and willingness to work could accumulate a fortune within his lifetime. As stories of success and wealth circulated, more people with the same dreams, hopes, and aspirations were attracted to our shores. Whenever the population became congested and opportunities seemed limited, people moved further to the West. In an incredibly short time the continent was spanned and the nation founded.

At first the attraction was land for agricultural purposes, but it was soon discovered that the country possessed other resources: timber, coal, minerals, and finally, oil. The individualists who had exploited the agricultural resources continued to exploit whatever of value they discovered. It was every man's privilege to find his own timber, metal ore, or oil well and to possess and exploit them in his own right. If wasteful methods of development were utilized, if forests were gutted for the choicest timber and mountain slopes left bare and exposed to flood and storm, no one was concerned because there were millions of acres left. Resources so vast could not be used up by the generation then at work.

From time to time a voice could be heard protesting that the resources were not limitless, that future generations were entitled to some consideration, and that the methods used for exploiting the resources were uneconomical and anti-social. Such warnings were usually unheeded. They were not in the prevailing tradition; they smacked of government regulation, even of socialism. The method might be wasteful, but freedom of action was considered more valuable than natural resources. The government was not to interfere with business. "Rugged individualism" and "less government in business" became twin slogans of the successful group in America.

Individualism in Education. As might be expected, all the institutions of society were dominated during this period by the tradition of individualism. Education was no exception to this rule. All that the school was asked to do was to give the individual the tools of learning and to fire him with ambition and zeal to succeed. His real education was expected to come in the contact with nature and in the struggle with the forces of nature and with the difficulties of frontier life. The aim of education was individualistic, in harmony with the needs of the nation and the temper of the times.

As conditions changed, following the conquest of the continent and the disappearance of the frontier, the demand for education increased. The goal remained the same, but the opportunities to achieve this goal were more limited. Free land was gone. The great timber, mineral, and oil resources were controlled by a comparatively small group of people. To achieve success under these conditions meant that an individual was no longer pitting his wits against nature but against men. The man best trained and best equipped seemed likely to win the biggest stakes. Hence in part came the demand for increased educational opportunities. Popular demands were reinforced by educators with statistical evidence that education "paid."

The individualistic tradition in education did not (and does not now) limit itself to the attitude that the schools are to train pupils for success in a competitive world. Men sometimes seek positions on boards of education not to further the interests of the community nor to insure sound education for children but to have a voice in the sale of coal, paint, and other supplies. Some men have been known to seek election to boards of education in order to punish teachers for having disciplined their children, or because they do not approve of the methods or materials used in the teacher's classroom. It seems not to occur to these people that their acts and attitudes are opposed to the orderly development of a social institution. In all such cases the school is regarded as an instrument for achieving selfish ambitions regardless of social consequences.

This tradition is further illustrated by the attitude prevalent in many sections of the country that stubbornly resist consolidation of schools. There are records of some high schools being maintained for six pupils and employing four teachers. Residents of a school district hesitate to yield control of their school to any larger unit. Local interest and pride in education has made the American system of education possible, but it becomes embarrassing when it will not yield to a demand for coöperation that would undeniably result in an improvement of educational facilities.

The results of this era of individualism in education, however, are upheld with pride. Without direction or pressure from an hereditary aristocracy our colonists built an educational system on the scale of their conquest of the continent. In almost every community in the land the school is the finest

building. It replaces temple and cathedral as the symbol of the faith and aspirations of the American people.

Changing Social and Economic Conditions. However notable were the accomplishments of individualism in society and in education under frontier conditions, recent social and economic changes have brought into dispute the further usefulness of the tradition. The frontier is closed, and society has moved on from an agrarian to an industrial civilization. In an agrarian society changes come slowly; life moves smoothly from generation to generation; the tempo is slow, and men can more easily accommodate themselves to the rhythm of affairs. In an industrial civilization changes are rapid, life moves at a constantly increased tempo, and the rhythm of life is set by the machine. Under agrarian conditions men work more or less alone; decisions are reached independently; consequences of decisions can affect at most a small group. In an industrial civilization men work together, supplement each other, are dependent upon one another; decisions are reached collectively, and the consequences of decisions affect a great number. In the earlier form of society the individual was the important factor; in the latter form, the group assumes increasing prominence.

As individualists we created a civilization that is the most productive and the most comfortable the world has ever known, but at the same time it has become the most interdependent. The old virtues of courage, self-reliance and determination are still valuable, but man can no longer be independent. He must share his neighbor's success and failure.

This condition prevails not only among industrial workers and farmers; it is true also, to an increasing extent, among the owning and employing group. Under conditions of a constantly expanding market it appeared to be good business to keep wages as low as possible and to have profits as high as possible. When confronted with a restricted market, operation under this scheme has nearly paralyzed American business. High profits lead to a concentration of wealth; concentrated wealth leads inevitably to the extension of the capital structure with resulting fixed charges and overhead. This in turn means increased production which can only be absorbed by increased consumption. It is rendered impossible by the very system of low wages that led to high profits and to the

concentration of wealth. Thus industry is brought to an impasse.²

While this is only one among the many and complex causes which have led to the current depression, it illustrates how the old order changes. High profits and low wages may lead to financial ruin, while high wages and low profits, if maintained with a fair degree of constancy, may lead to prosperity. The rich man's prosperity can no longer be independent of that of the other members of his society.

The depression has brought home many other hard lessons in the value of coöperation. With the country potentially richer than ever before, millions of the unemployed, whatever their individual virtues, are left powerless to earn even the necessities of life. We have not learned to divide our labor nor the abundance which it produces. No generation of mankind has ever thought through the problem of how to provide adequately for the wants of all. Each man has been trained to provide only for himself and for his family. It is obvious that this way of thinking about the work of the world is no longer adequate to maintain society at its present level of technological progress.

Other factors seem to be evident also. American industry must submit to some sort of discipline; a discipline of orderly production, fair and reasonable prices, healthful and sanitary working conditions, and a reasonable degree of security for the worker. The discipline may be imposed by industry itself, by organized labor, or by the government, but it must be imposed. Industry and business can no longer be regarded solely as a means of individual wealth and power, but as a source of social security and well-being.

Types of Social Control. As a means for extending this social control over industry the American people are confronted with three choices: fascism, communism, and democracy. As Plato predicted, other democracies in the history of the world have ended in tyranny when they failed to solve the economic problems of their societies. The modern form of tyranny would seem to be fascism, a resurgent Caesarism, which has always led to imperialism and war. American society shows many significant tendencies in this direction, and may well go the way which Plato predicted. On the other hand it may extend its fundamental beliefs into the economic realm,

²For an extended account of the growing concentration of wealth in industry see Harry W. Laidler: *Concentration of Control in American Industry*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1931.

which has been relatively uncontrolled by democratic theory, and achieve a form of communism. This is a way out for democracy which Plato did not foresee, but one which seems at present to be highly improbable. It conflicts too directly with the tradition of individualism, and it suffers by being exemplified in the Russian experiment which outraged American sensibilities by its denial of civil liberties—especially by its suppression of religion—and by its dictatorship of the proletariat. All the powerful forces of property are against it, and on the side of fascism. The only other choice open to the American people at the present time that is widely enough supported to make its adoption credible is some extension and re-interpretation of democratic theory to make possible a planned economy without going so far as to make industry and government synonymous, as does communism.

Under the present administration democracy has shown itself capable of a degree of social control over industry. It persuaded the leading industries to adopt a form of self-imposed regulation under "codes." These were promptly used by the prominent individualists in charge of the larger industrial establishments as a device to fix prices and to defeat their weaker competitors. Their provisions for shortening hours and raising wages were disregarded almost at once. However, a vestige of social control over industry still remains, and may be extended as the precedent takes hold of the popular imagination. The work-relief program and the control over agricultural production, achieved for the first time in American history, show the beginnings of an attempt at a planned economy, and the newer tax program may lead to something like a redistribution of wealth. The results up to the present have not offered convincing evidence that democracy can pit itself against the forces of rampant individualism, but they indicate that at least an attempt will be made in this direction.

This review of the development of the individualistic tradition in American society has necessarily been too brief to be anything but superficial. It has been discussed so thoroughly, however, in recent educational literature that for the informed reader a mere enumeration of the factors taken into account will suffice as a basis for the discussion of the educational implications.

The Educational Implications. Just as the pioneer tradition of individualism was reflected in the schools, the recent changes in the direction of increasing social coöperation and

control have had repercussions in educational literature and discussion, and to a lesser extent, in educational practices. The older studies of history, geography, and civics have quite generally been merged into the field of the social studies, which attempts a comprehensive study of the conditions under which men may live and work together successfully. Schools have everywhere begun to study the social and economic structure of their local communities, not in a spirit of astonishment as in the past, but in a spirit of critical inquiry. Schools have suffered greatly during the depression, having suddenly to provide for all the children who in better times would be at work. To do this with a reduced budget, fewer teachers, and almost no new facilities has meant a tremendous strain, which has left teachers very thoughtful about the meaning of it all.

A characteristic product of the era of individualism in education was the "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education." It was an admirable document, with a vision of the purposes and possibilities of secondary education that towers head and shoulders above contemporary educational practice. It was, however, still consistent with a philosophy of individualism. Even its goal of "citizenship" was discussed in political and ethical terms with almost no hint of an economic application.

The corresponding document of the present era in education is probably the Report of the Committee on the Social-Economic Goals for America, which has already been discussed in Issue I.³ It strives to formulate a program for education not out of any abstract consideration of the nature of education, but out of an intelligent understanding of the goals which American society must set for itself. It is now realized that the individual cannot attain such goals through his own efforts. They are group goals, to be reached only through united effort.

This shift in educational opinion from individualism to a social view implies that educational practice will increasingly be directed toward the welfare and progress of society, and will concern itself with the welfare and progress of the individual only in so far as these promise to contribute to the welfare and progress of society. Educators, however, are sadly unprepared for the change. Ask any ten of them what program of education for John Smith, aged fourteen, will pro-

³Issue I, pp. 50-51.

mote the welfare and progress of society, and you will get ten different answers. They will resemble one another only in being very superficial and very tentative. Ask them, however, what program of education will promote the welfare and progress of John Smith, and you will begin to get a working agreement. The answers will also have an air of professional competence. To develop that same competence in providing for the interests of society is a task for educational leadership.

III. THE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUE

Education and the State. The mere drift of opinion toward a social view of education is not sufficient to establish the soundness of this view. Some fundamental principle is needed to define the social view of education and to justify it in opposition to the individualistic view. Such a principle has been enunciated by Professor Briggs: "The State maintains free public education to perpetuate itself and to promote its own interests. Free public education is a long-term investment that the State may be a better place in which to live and in which to make a living."⁴

We have in this thesis, liberally interpreted, a fundamental principle upon which to base the social view of education and by which to gauge the effectiveness of the work of the schools. Society realizes that the values which it is seeking are adopted by the young as their own only through education. It also realizes that the young must be disciplined in order to coöperate effectively with others in seeking those values. It therefore establishes schools in which the young are expected to come to some agreement with their fellow men as to what values they are to seek, and how they are to pursue them in common. Only in this manner can society achieve a degree of organization in which the attainment of any value is possible, including even the maintenance of life.

Any chance deviation on the part of an immature individual accepting these values, especially the fundamental ideals and practices upon which social coöperation is based, must be checked. Since democracy is one of the controlling ideals or principles of our society, it is particularly important in education. It must be understood, accepted, and practiced by the young if our society is to have any final authority to regulate the harmonious inter-action of its members.

⁴T. H. Briggs: *The Great Investment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Other societies, organized around different controlling principles, have not hesitated to use their schools as an instrument of social control and national solidarity. An outstanding instance of the deliberate use of education to re-create society occurred in Germany during the Napoleonic period. It had been the battle ground of Europe for a generation. Its states had lost their identity, character, and power. In Prussia under the leadership of Fichte an educational program was drafted to train its citizens as "God-fearing, country-loving, self-supporting subjects of Imperial Germany." The results of the experiment are well known. Prussia marched forward to become the dominant state in Germany and ultimately to challenge the western world.

The modern educational developments in Germany, Italy, and Russia are also well known. All these countries set out to build a new and vital society. They realized that this purpose could not be achieved unless there were substantial agreement among their citizens as to the basic principles upon which they were to operate. Such agreement cannot be reached among adults who have been conditioned in various and conflicting directions. It can only be built through education, through conditioning in one central direction from early childhood. Hence these countries did not hesitate to use education to organize their societies upon a new basis. Whether we agree with the basic principles of these societies or not, we are compelled to admit that these principles could be built into the fabric of the national life only through education.

Nor is this effort to use the schools to further national ideals limited to Germany, Italy, and Russia. It would seem from an examination of the school systems of Europe that this conception of education is quite generally accepted. William F. Russell in *Schools in Bulgaria* reports: "Their (the agrarian parties') contribution was the adjustment of an entire educational system to a national end." He adds, significantly, "This is the lesson that America needs to learn." France also regards her school system definitely as an agency for national perpetuation and improvement. Felix Pecaut, in the *International Institute Yearbook, 1929*, says, "Education in France, then, is the effort by which France aims to perpetuate herself in what is characteristic of her social structure, distinctive in her modes of thought and feeling, in what history has made her, what she is now, and what she is in the process of becoming." If these countries, with homogeneous populations, es-

tablished cultures and traditions, and a governmental structure firmly established in the mores of the people need to give careful and systematic attention to the inculcation of the major ideals and values of their societies, it must seem reasonable that a state with a heterogeneous population, an emerging culture, and a governmental structure constantly in flux and responsive to the needs of a dynamic society should give careful attention to the function of the school as an instrument for social solidarity and progress.

The objection may be raised that such a conception of the school involves deliberate and systematic propaganda. In a certain sense this is true. A teacher who professes ideals contrary or hostile to those of democracy has short tenure in our society. In the patriotic handbooks there are listed hundreds of individuals and organizations that would never be permitted to conduct the social science classes of our public schools. Our society is as thoroughly convinced as the societies of Europe that the young must first be brought into substantial agreement with the central coördinating principle of their society. After they reach adulthood, they may consider proposed deviations from this principle with an adequate knowledge of the consequences involved.

We have not, however, cultivated democratic ideals, principles, and values in our schools with sufficient care and attention. Acceptance of the rule of the majority is almost universally attained, but not such subsidiary principles as toleration of the opinion of the minority, and freedom of thought, speech, and assembly. To imagine that a society can reach substantial agreement on such principles purely through the unfettered play of the intelligence is to entertain a naive faith in the celestial origin of our own fundamental assumptions. It is time we learned that our society drilled us in those assumptions as a working basis for our association with our fellow men. Now it is not only our right but our duty to inculcate these same principles, as they are now understood by our society, in the young.

Promoting the Interests of the State. Under the individualistic conception of education the affairs of government were regarded as incidental, or at best as a necessary evil. With the increasing importance of government in regulating the collective activities of society it is essential to build an interested, informed, and active electorate. We must realize that the business of government calls for the highest type

of skill, training, and character. It can no longer be turned over to second-rate men as a reward for political favors. We must learn that we as citizens are not competent to pass upon the increasingly specialized matters of state, but that we must elect men whom we can trust, who will in turn delegate to experts the matters that call for expert competence.

On account of our splendid isolation, our absence of any close or traditional enemies, and our wealth of natural resources, we have been very complacent as a nation about utilizing our educational system as other nations have used theirs. With the increasing collectivism of our national economy, however, which depends upon the understanding coöperation of millions of scattered workers for its successful maintenance, we must definitely seek an organization of our educational resources that will promote the interests of our society. As the conditions of our economic life become more stringent, they will demand an ever higher degree of organization among our citizens. Such organization can be directed only through education.

"A Better Place in Which to Live." When education is organized upon this basis, it focuses attention upon the goal of making the State "a better place in which to live." Dividends on the investment of the State in education must first be made in terms of a better organization of the life of a community. We have long been aware of differences in neighborhoods and have attributed these differences almost wholly to differences in wealth. Where there is a reasonable degree of wealth, a residential neighborhood will reflect it in its architecture, landscaping, freedom from noise and traffic, music centers, art galleries, parks and recreational facilities, and other common means for better living. While wealth plays its part in this improvement, the factor of education should not be overlooked. People of liberal education demand beautiful surroundings and cultural opportunities. Life is intolerable without them. If schools would consciously develop ideals, attitudes, and tastes for the things that make community life fine and wholesome, our society would soon be rid of its slums, both intellectual and material.

The better neighborhoods have another advantage that is in part the product of education. They are safer and more law-abiding. Studies in juvenile delinquency show that it tends to concentrate in the poorer areas. The good community is relatively free from delinquency not because of its wealth

but because of its common ideals, its response to the conventions of life, its sensitivity to the rules of the game, and its regard for the common welfare. These are the results of education, both in school and at home. The police power of government does not make a community good. Communities are good because the people who live there have been made good through the inculcation of appropriate standards and ideals. If this is true of one community, it can be made more nearly true of all communities. It must be the conscious aim of schools to produce citizens who want communities of this type. This must be based upon a clear understanding of what the good citizen does, how he thinks, what he believes, and to what ideals he gives his loyalty.

A recent study of crime prevention and juvenile delinquency conducted in New York City and reported by Maller in the *New York Times* concludes:

Prevention of delinquency and the treatment of delinquents are essentially educational and psychological problems and must be treated as such. It is fair to criticise the Crime Prevention Bureau, on which the city spends some \$600,000 a year, not on the ground that such work is unimportant but that it is among the most important functions of the classroom and the clinic.

The school is expected to prevent failure in reading and writing and to remedy such failure when it arises. Why not hold it also responsible for preventing failure in learning the differences between right and wrong, and for doing remedial work whenever such failure is evident? To doubt the school's capacity to do this and to believe that policemen (and policewomen) are more capable is an indictment against our whole educational system.

While this quotation does not take into consideration the fact that the causes of juvenile delinquency are many and complex, many of them totally beyond the school's control, it reinforces the point that if the school were to focus specifically on the problem of "making the State a better place in which to live," it could do much to help solve the problem of juvenile delinquency.

We have had the objective of citizenship for a long time, but its application has been restricted too narrowly to political problems. We have concerned ourselves too much with the machinery of government and too little with the spirit and action of government. Citizenship in terms of community responsibilities begins in the school community. The machinery is incidental if pupils are given real problems to solve, real goals to achieve, and the highest examples of coöperative endeavor, and if they are given emotional satisfactions that

come from achievement in a common enterprise that to them has value and significance. They should be encouraged to examine and to evaluate governmental and social enterprises in the adult world in terms of the ideals and values which they have been trained to apply to their own. Habits and attitudes inculcated in such fashion should produce citizens that will make the State "a better place in which to live."

"And in Which to Make a Living." Education can also help to make of the community "a better place in which to make a living" in a variety of ways. It can inculcate the conviction that every good citizen ought to be able and willing to provide adequately for himself and his family. It can build up a spirit of craftsmanship, of pride in work well done—partly by refusing to accept slovenly work in school. If a high degree of excellence is desired and an ideal of mastery is upheld, it must be supported by requiring work that has significance to the pupils. The school cannot indulge in mere busywork. If pupils are made aware of the significance of the work they are assigned—if they are made to see the purpose of a particular task in relation to the whole—they will accept the ideal of mastery and of craftsmanship. Our failure to arrange courses and subject matter to accomplish these objectives is one reason for the desire of pupils just to "get by."

Too often in the past, vocational education has sought only to produce a narrow skill, and has turned out pupils wholly unaware of the fundamental problems of business and industry. The world just now is suffering not from lack of skills but from faulty management of material and personnel, faulty design and layout of plant and equipment, inadequate provisions for regularity of employment, and other problems of this type. These are problems, in the main, for the expert. But pupils properly educated are made aware of their existence, have some idea of a reasonable solution, and will not be led astray by wholly impossible schemes for curing our economic ills. If we are to have a rational economic order, one that can assure a reasonable amount of security for all, it will be produced by people who are not only competent in their particular field, but who have been given an insight into the larger problems of the economic organization. Industry can provide training in skills, but industry cannot be expected to provide training for the larger and more permanent interests of society. This is the job of the school. The school's provision for vocational education will be discussed more at length in Issue

V, but it may be said here that if the school consciously promotes an ideal of craftsmanship, competence of performance, an understanding of the fundamental economic facts and principles, and an ideal of a rational order of economic life, it cannot fail to make of the State "a better place in which to make a living."

IV. SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE APPROVED ALTERNATIVE.

Public Opinion. We have argued that society provides schools in order to perpetuate itself and to promote its own interests—not the interests of the pupils who are being educated except in so far as these coincide with its own. Society, however, is by no means agreed upon this position. Indeed, if a poll were taken among the citizens who have voted to provide school funds, it is likely that the majority would say that they had in mind the interests of the boys and girls who were to be educated, not their own interests as members of society. Even those who argue that democracy requires the education of all its citizens commonly do so on the ground that democracy implies equality of opportunity; hence every citizen should be given an equal opportunity through education to make of himself whatever he can.

This objection may be met in three ways. The most common is to reply that it is impossible to justify general taxation for school support on the basis of its benefit to the pupil. Those who have no children, it is argued, would refuse to pay. The reply may justly be made, however, that apparently society does justify general taxation for school support on this basis, since it is the prevailing view, and the schools are still supported after a fashion. Those who have no children might even be convinced that it was their duty to provide education for the sake of the rising generation, regardless of its effect upon organized society by such arguments as the following:

1. You were educated by the community. It is now your turn to help educate others.

2. You have some regard for the welfare of the young, whether you have children of your own or not. You would not like to see them growing up wild, ignorant, mischievous, utterly incapable of providing for themselves when their turn comes.

3. Your income is derived from the organized effort of the whole community. If the majority of the community, who have children, wish to use a part of this income to promote a common enterprise, such as education, they have a right to do so.

4. You, personally, profit by education. You can count on elementary decency from your neighbors and associates only by educating them throughout the community.

5. No feasible plan can be devised for separating the school tax from the common levy. It is simpler and more economical to levy general taxes, and to divide the revenues according to the needs of the various community services. A direct tax upon parents for the education of their children has proved to be inadequate, inequitable, and uncollectible.

While such arguments as these are not commonly invoked to convince the childless individual that he is bound to help support the schools, they would be if the voting strength of parents ever failed to carry a school bond issue. Hence it cannot be maintained that general taxation for school support is unjustifiable on grounds of its benefit to the boys and girls who are to be educated. As a matter of fact, the natural solicitude of any society for the welfare of the young is probably a more universal, stable, and dependable basis for school support than a long-range view of the interests of society. It would be difficult to convince the average voter that his interests, as a member of society, were at stake in a school bond issue. It would be far easier to convince him that the interests of the boys and girls whom he knew and loved were at stake. It may be the wisest course for society to let the demand for education rest upon its benefit to the boys and girls for whom education is provided.

There are, however, two other ways of meeting the objection that our society is not convinced that the schools are maintained to promote its own interests. The first is that this attitude is the logical outcome of the tradition of individualism in our society, which is everywhere being forced to yield to a social view. The man in the street will now admit that he is helpless to provide for his own welfare solely through his own efforts. He realizes that he can prosper only as society prospers, and that he will inevitably suffer as society suffers, no matter what his individual merits may be. This is the first premise in a social view. Its conclusions, however, are so complex, and have to be applied to so many different social insti-

tutions that it is no wonder that many of these institutions are still regarded in terms of the old individualistic tradition. Those who are in charge of these institutions, however, must be alert to the consequences of the social view which is beginning to prevail in our society. They can no longer regard their work in terms of an outmoded tradition. They must also assist the public in defining the social view with respect to their institutions which, in the course of time, it will inevitably adopt anyway.

The third way of meeting the objection that society at present supports the schools for the benefit of the boys and girls who are in them is that this individual "benefit" is unconsciously construed as the welfare and progress of society. The adult assumes that children will come to desire the values that he is seeking, and that he will realize that they can be attained only through social coöperation. When this point is attained, as we have seen before, there is no conflict of interest between the individual and his society. It is only as children and other immature members of society fail to accept the goals of their society or the accepted methods of pursuing them that this issue arises. When such a conflict occurs, the adult is immediately on the side of his society, as opposed to the selfish and short-sighted interests of an individual. Hence it may be said that in a sense, even though the majority of adults are convinced that they support the schools for the benefit of the individuals who are to be educated, they nevertheless support them to promote the welfare and progress of their society. It is this confusion between the interests of the individual and the interests of society that would enable society to enlist parental solicitude in support of its schools, and still maintain toward them the social view that is coming to be characteristic of modern society.

Professional Preparation. As was hinted earlier, educators are sadly unprepared for a social view of their calling. They are fairly competent to map out a program of education for a particular boy that will meet his immediate and obvious needs, but they falter and stammer when asked to map out a program of education for the same boy that will best meet the needs of society. It may well be asked: Will they not serve society better by educating well for the welfare of the individual than by educating badly for the welfare of society?

The answer to this question cannot be evaded by saying that the interests of the individual and those of society ulti-

mately coincide; hence serving one means serving the other. Let the point be reiterated: the interests of the individual and of his society come to coincide only as the individual learns to want the things which his society wants, and to pursue them in the socially accepted manner. If educators have no clear idea of the major values which their society is organized to pursue nor of the mores, traditions, and technology by which it pursues them, they are very likely to condition the young to want things which would be exceedingly detrimental to the welfare of their society, and to operate in ways which would raise havoc with our society's pursuit of happiness. The training of hundreds of thousands of boys and girls who happen to be a shade brighter than their classmates as though they were budding Shakespeares is a case in point. Such children are apt to grow up with the idea that the only interesting and worth-while occupation is that of the writer. They are likely to adopt the exaggerated Bohemian traits and attitudes which are commonly associated in the minds of the young with the craft of writing. That this deprives their society of the whole-hearted participation of its most promising members for a term of years, perhaps for a lifetime, means nothing to their adoring English teachers. The value of education in the arts is beyond question, but the attempt to make every intelligent individual a writer illustrates a very common conflict between the "interests" of an individual and the interests of society.

Although it cannot be denied that at present educators are better prepared to follow individual interests wherever they may lead than to guide these interests in socially desirable directions, it is a task for educational leadership to define the values which our society is pursuing and to reveal the means by which they are attained. The recent report of the Committee on the Social-Economic Goals for America furnishes exactly the sort of leadership education must have if it is to play its part in organizing society to achieve its major purposes.

Neglect of the Individual. A third objection to the social view of education may be that it completely subordinates the individual to the group, that under such a scheme the individual surrenders all rights, and that this is but a new proposal to exploit the individual in behalf of the larger unit, the State. This is not the case. Although we uphold the obvious truth that in a highly interdependent society some

agreement upon major aims and values must be reached, this does not imply that all pupils will be trained alike. Our society is extremely complex and has need of all possible skill, power, and talent. We have need of people who are trained in every field of human activity: science, the arts and crafts, the professions, business, industry, agriculture, and homemaking.

It should be realized, moreover, that the high value which is placed upon individual freedom in our society is simply another of the prevailing social ideals which it becomes the duty of the school to inculcate. Pupils have to learn to tolerate differences in opinion, in taste, and in patterns of behavior. Such tolerance is not the product of chance nor of natural development nor of the unfettered play of the intellect. It is a social value, deliberately inculcated in our society, not achieved nor even desired in many other societies.

The freedom which is granted to the individual is still restrained within reasonable limits in our society. If his individual deviations from the goals and practices of his society threaten its major values, such as security, justice, freedom, truth, beauty, love, and health, he is scolded, snubbed, discharged, or put into jail. This implies the criterion that individual deviations are praiseworthy so long as they conduce to the welfare and progress of society. If not, they are restrained, no matter what the effect may be upon the individual.

The role of the individual in our society has been ably set forth by John Dewey in a radio address: "Only in respect to methods of thought and judgment should the earlier individualistic aim be retained; there it should be intensified. Democracy will be a farce unless individuals are trained to think for themselves, to judge independently, to be critical, to be able to detect subtle propaganda and the motives which inspire it. Mass production and uniform regimentation have been growing in the degree in which individual opportunity has waned. The current must be reversed. The motto must be: 'Learn to act with and for others while you learn to think and judge for yourself'."

V. WHAT ACCEPTANCE INVOLVES AND IMPLIES

Meeting the Issue. In meeting the issue it is not enough to say that the rights of society have never been denied. What the situation demands is a positive program, accepting the proposed thesis as its basis, which will be accepted whole-

heartedly by the tax-payer and by the educator. That such a program cannot be postponed is increasingly evident. The recent attacks on the schools would have been less savage activities which contribute most directly to making the State is the goal of public education. The demands on the part of selfish interests that the educational program be reduced to the simplicity of an earlier generation, eliminating the activities which contribute most directly to making the State "a better place in which to live and in which to make a living" would not have been tolerated by a society which realized that its own institutions were endangered by such demands.

The fact that the attacks upon the schools have centered upon the activities which are most effective in developing social coöperation makes it evident either that educators have not accepted a social view of education, or that their patrons have not adopted the social view, or that selfish interests have deliberately sabotaged the emerging organization of society under pleas of economy and tax reduction. Probably all these are true. In any case, if American secondary education is to become a vital factor in modern life, it must be reorganized on the basis of the second alternative of this issue.

Responsibilities in the Choice of Alternatives. We believe that the decision of the secondary-school people of this country will inevitably be in favor of the social view of education. The acceptance of this alternative offers new challenges and opportunities, and demands that certain decisions be made and their responsibilities accepted. Some of these are:

1. Secondary education must promote a calm acceptance of democracy as the central controlling principle of our society. The word "calm" may be emphasized, because the major values of a society are not its most passionate convictions; they are the ideas which are taken for granted. The undignified flag-waving in which so many educators indulge is not only unnecessary but undesirable. It should be remembered that society exerts many forms of control—social, economic, religious, traditional, cultural—to insure the harmonious interaction of its members. One of these happens to be a formal political organization. It is usually far less successful than the other institutions of society in doing what it is supposed to do, and it frequently betrays its constituents into wars, which are a constant menace to the orderly progress of civilization. Nevertheless, these various forms of government are

the object of the most extraordinary enthusiasm on the part of their adherents. Few of these people would contend that their manner of greeting one another or of doing business, their national cookery or their native architecture, their automobiles or their idea of heredity were produced by God-given inspiration, worth dying for, if necessary, to preserve in their present state. Yet they indulge in this irrational conduct for their form of government, whatever it may be at the time. It must be evident to them in their saner moments that just as society has experimented with innumerable forms of government in the past, it must continue to do so if it is ever to evolve one which is to be anything like satisfactory. Yet even the most sincere attempt to alter or improve the present form of government, no matter what it is, is greeted as an act of treason. A similar attitude in the laboratory would result in the execution of a scientist if he attempted or even proposed a new experiment.

American secondary education must not be prostituted to maintain this anti-social view of democracy—a view which, if directed toward any other social institution, would not be tolerated in schools for a moment. The point of view which is proposed is a calm agreement among sensible men that in questions involving the interests of a group, we shall abide by the decision of the majority, while we respect and tolerate the opinion of the minority and give them every opportunity to express it. We do not contend that this is the only sensible method of arriving at a decision; we only contend that it is the method most nearly in accord at the present time with the traditions of our society. We shall change it whenever the majority of our citizens agree to the change. Meanwhile we shall abide by the other institutions and practices of our society which this central controlling principle implies, or which have become intimately associated with it through historical processes.

2. Secondary education must define and inculcate the major goals and practices of our society. There can be no conflict between the welfare and progress of an individual and the welfare and progress of society when the individual completely accepts the values of his society and its method of pursuing them. While the processes of education are incomplete, however, an individual may desire many things which are detrimental to the welfare and progress of society, or he may pursue a worthy goal in an anti-social manner. It is the business of education to check such deviations from

the major patterns of our society. In this instance, the word "major" should be emphasized. Society values all sorts of deviations from the norm in matters which are not vital to its welfare and progress, but childish tendencies toward cruelty, laziness, dishonesty, hatred and the like are repressed.

Secondary education has done little deliberately to educate the will. It has assumed that individuals can be taught to do things but not to want things that are socially desirable. This is clearly untrue: everything that an individual wants he was taught to want by his society. Even the vague uneasiness of the stomach is directed by one society toward mangoes, by another toward figs, by another toward steak and French fried potatoes. When desires are opposed to the interests of society, faulty education is to blame. If educators have no clear idea of the major aims and values of our society and of the mores, traditions, and technology by which we pursue them, they are likely to create or to condone such conflicts between the individual and his society. Yet only a beginning has been made in education toward defining the major goals and practices of our society.

The point should be reiterated that this does not imply social regimentation nor the denial of individual liberties. Respect for individual liberty is, in fact, one of the most difficult of social ideals to inculcate. It is the product only of a thorough culture. At the same time it "draws the line" at certain practices which are clearly inimical to the best interests of society. It is the task of education to develop this discriminating tolerance.

3. If secondary education is thought of as a long-term investment that the State may become "a better place in which to live and in which to make a living," it must be held responsible for producing dividends on the investment. The public, who are stockholders in this great investment, are not ordinarily competent to pass judgment upon professional details of educational procedure, but in a democratic society they have not only the right but the obligation to be informed concerning the major purposes of their educational program and concerning its success in achieving these purposes.

Our citizens pride themselves upon their business acumen. If they were asked to invest their money in something that was vaguely described as "a gold mine or an oil well or something of the sort," they would demand a clearer explanation. If upon further investigation they approved of the investment, they would require some account of its earnings.

An account of its activities would not do; a balance sheet would be demanded.

The monetary parallel must not be pressed too far, but our citizens have actually invested a very considerable sum of money in secondary education. In return they are given no clear account of the purposes of their investment nor of its success in achieving these purposes. Even the instruments for evaluating the effectiveness of the educational program are lacking. Only a minor and relatively insignificant segment of its objectives is covered by the ordinary paper-and-pencil examinations.

It would have a bracing effect upon the educational program if it became customary for every superintendent of schools to report annually in the public press to his constituency the success or failure of each major division of school work in bringing about changes in pupil behavior that were of convincing significance and worth. The proposal at present seems fantastic because we lack reliable and valid means of demonstrating such progress, but in the longer view is it not reasonable that the public which provides education should receive some account of its effectiveness?

At least the spirit and intention of this proposal might be carried out by a more careful evaluation of school work in terms of socially significant goals, and the submission of these results to parents and to boards of education. The usual monthly report of almost meaningless marks in courses might be replaced by a more careful analysis, quarterly or semi-annually, of the pupil's progress toward the major objectives of the school. A more adequate system of records might be devised for noting such progress and its probable causes and implications.

4. Significant curriculum revision must be carried out. So much straw has been threshed in this field with such a meager yield of good grain that one hesitates to attack it again. Yet so little of the current program has any demonstrable relationship to the welfare and progress of society that revision is imperative. Such revision has been hampered in the past by one fatal misstep. School after school has thought through its objectives—has decided what changes in pupil behavior it wished to bring about. Then it has thrust the whole problem back into the lap of the traditional subject-matter divisions of the curriculum by saying: "Now show us what your subject contributes to these objectives." That question is as fatal as the backward look of Orpheus into

Hades. It only leads to rationalization of the traditional subject-matter, and Eurydice is lost forever. If the school has thought through its objectives sincerely, without reference to the objectives of the usual academic courses, if it knows specifically how it proposes to contribute to the welfare and progress of society, the next step is clearly to envision what kind of experiences will most effectively bring about the desired changes in pupil behavior. These experiences may be drawn from any walk of life, from any category of human relations. If any compromise with the traditional program has to be made, it should be made after the possibilities of an entirely new approach to the social objectives of secondary education have been fully explored.

5. The training and selection of teachers must have in view the welfare and progress of society. Teachers are usually judged in terms of knowledge of some archaic subject-matter, years of "successful" experience in imparting this subject-matter to others, and personal appearance. Their ideas as to ways and means of educating children so as to make a positive contribution to society in its present state have seldom been requested, and if requested, have not been forthcoming. The training of teachers has concentrated upon techniques and methods to the neglect of the larger task of the school. Techniques should not be neglected, but more important are an inquiring mind, an adventurous spirit, an abiding interest in the world of affairs, and a sense of the significance of pupil behavior in terms of its effect upon the common welfare.

VI. CONSEQUENCES OF THE CHOICE

The adoption of a social view of education as opposed to an individualistic view may be reduced in theory to the reorientation of the impulses of incompletely socialized individuals, but it is bound to have emotional connotations which pour adrenalin into the blood. It means participation in the creation of a new order, educationally and socially. It means that we must frankly admit the weaknesses and inadequacies of the present system of education and resolutely set about a reorganization of our own. We must agree as to ideals and values, cast aside our academic prejudices, and take our chances with utterly new types of work. The thesis of this discussion presents a real challenge to those who are adventurous enough to relish the opportunity to participate

in the reconstruction of education in the light of a new and more vital principle.

VII. HOW SHALL THE INVESTMENT BE MADE?

As the funds available for "long-term investment" in education are always and everywhere limited, such questions as the following must be constantly answered. In what program of education can investments be made which will yield the largest social return? Shall investments be made equally in all types of childhood and youth? Shall investments be larger or smaller in human material less promising in natural endowments than in the more promising material? Shall the investment be made on the basis of fitness or need? How may the investment serve life at its best rather than the narrow interests of a particular locality?

The importance of these questions is obvious to the thoughtful student of secondary education. A partial answer is made in every major decision in practical school management. The difficulty is that the decisions are not based upon a clearly conceived and pragmatic philosophy of education that has been accepted by the majority of people engaged in secondary-school administration and teaching. Lacking agreement themselves, educators have made no effort to convince the supporting public of the importance of the questions and the urgency of adequate answers.

A careful reading of the arguments presented in Issues I and II will reveal that most of these questions have been met by this committee. The increased investment by society for the extended program of secondary education necessitated by modern economic and social conditions must justify itself in making "the State a better place in which to live and in which to make a living." This will be accomplished by placing increased emphasis upon a program to develop the gifted individual to maximum capacity and at the same time instilling in such individuals a feeling of obligation to return to society maximum service for this training. This service will take a variety of forms—but in every form the social organization is better for having made the investment. As argued in Issue II, all youth will receive a portion of the investment until they are ready to take their places in adult society or in other forms of education more appropriate to their needs. All must be educated sufficiently to secure their intelligent and responsible participation in the collective endeavor of their

society to provide adequately for the needs of all its members. No compromise can be made with this principle. What is desirable for the gifted must not take precedence over what is essential for anyone. The "investment" must not be narrowly conceived, as in the psychology of the contemporary business man. Society is not gambling on the success of gifted individuals. It is responsible for the care and education of all youth from birth to maturity. The investment of educational funds must only be concerned to serve life most effectively through an appropriate education for all: to each in the measure of his need, from each in the measure of his strength.

.

ISSUE IV

Shall secondary education provide a common curriculum for all, or differentiated offerings?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

So diverse are the capacities and interests of the boys and girls crowding into the secondary schools and so anxious are the educational profession and the public to have all pupils derive something worth while from their educational experience that secondary schools which fail to provide a differentiated curriculum or to allow for differences in a pupil's rate of progress are conspicuously rare.

There has been no absence of critics, however, to challenge this shift from the staple fare of the traditional program to the cafeteria-like multiplicity of dishes which the schools now serve. The hasty organization of new courses of study and their introduction into the curriculum, critics argue, is an important factor in the lapse of scholarship characteristic of modern education, and their very number is confusing to the pupil. Presented with the necessity of making difficult choices, he lacks the wisdom, foresight, and knowledge of the future necessary to choose wisely. On the other hand, the need for the social integration of America's mobile population is very great, and the secondary school would do well to confine itself to a basic curriculum designed for that purpose.

Although these arguments cannot be lightly brushed aside, they are really protests against extreme extensions of a differentiated program rather than a fatal thrust at the principle on which it is based. The principle of differentiation is in itself indestructible. It recognizes the inescapable fact of the range of difference in the capacities and interests of individuals, pedagogical inconveniences no doubt, but source of that individuality which we depend upon for progress and culture. It allows for the proper recognition of a pupil's interests as a motivating factor, in the knowledge that a pupil is most effectively moved when he is convinced that his studies will be serviceable to him. And it alone provides for that specialization and refinement of talents, beginning in adolescence, which, by the division of labor, supplies our ma-

terial needs, and, when successfully expressed, secures to the individual the spiritual values of life.

The final resolution of the issue must take into account both the need for social integration and the importance of recognizing individual differences in promoting economy of learning and in providing the specialization which life demands. It is a mistake, however, to assume that social integration requires common experiences for all individuals. A single body of educational experience neither represents equality of opportunity nor does it guarantee superiority of results. But a differentiated curriculum can serve both integration and specialization, whereas a common curriculum cannot.

The cost of a differentiated program is not an irrefutable objection, for, like all effective education, it is an investment that pays returns, not an expense involving loss. Nor should we over-emphasize the inability of the pupil to make wise choices; no one presumes that the speculative element in life can be entirely removed, and adequate guidance will reduce it here to a minimum. There are, of course, practical limitations to a program of differentiation, especially in small schools or where leadership lags, but in curriculum construction educators have the assurance that the principle of differentiation is sound.

I. THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

Definition of "Common Curriculum." For the purposes of this discussion the "common curriculum" is defined as the kind of curriculum in which all pupils in the same grade of the same school system take the same subjects. It is therefore a curriculum of constants, since electives would bring about differentiation. Under a plan of ability grouping, nothing would be omitted from the curriculum for slow pupils, and nothing would be added to the curriculum for bright pupils. It is not assumed, however, that the learning outcomes are the same for all pupils.

Definition of "Differentiated Curriculum." The term "differentiated curriculum" applies to all those curricula which do not conform to the above definition of "common curriculum." Accordingly, any instance in which the school deliberately makes the curricular offering for some pupils different from that for others characterizes the curriculum as "differentiated." A curriculum which includes a body of content intended to be common to all pupils, but which includes also "electives" or other examples of differentiation, is a "differentiated curriculum."

It should be noted that there is no attempt here to construct a definition of "common curriculum" which would allow a modicum of variation. To do so would reduce the issue to the question "How much differentiation is wise?" The hypothetical definition here set up is intended to

sharpen the issue and thus bring into the clash points of view which are definitely and genuinely opposed. A great many educators who read these definitions will immediately raise the question whether there remains any considerable difference of opinion on the matter. Many of them have years ago concluded that without some degree of differentiation a secondary-school curriculum is inconceivable. The opinions which give rise to the controversy are those of educators and laymen who are urging the elimination of electives as a means to social integration and financial economy.

Current Objections to Differentiation. The American secondary school is accused by some of its critics of conducting an educational cafeteria. It is alleged that the bill of fare has grown beyond all reason and that some of the offerings are so thin and demand so little of genuine mental exercise as to be entirely devoid of nutritive value. Or, to change the figure, warning is given that under the typical regime today it is quite possible for a pupil by dint of clever footwork to thread his way through the maze of the high school curriculum without losing cuticle on the rough edges of tough problems or raising callouses against the hard handles of heavy educational implements.¹ To this the curriculum makers reply that there is no disputing the fact of individual differences in ability and interest, that the responsibility for the varied offering rests with our Maker, who neglected to cut us all by the same pattern.

The critics go on to say that the differentiated curriculum requires the adolescent to make a kind of choice, for which he lacks the maturity; that in fact, instead of selecting subjects, he actually chooses teachers or time schedules or instructional accessories or other things unrelated to his peculiar needs. In rebuttal, the school points out that the pupil in his problems of election is not without benefit of pedagogy; that guidance officers, as well as parents, are consulted. Perhaps this guidance has its limitations; if so, better guidance is the remedy rather than elimination of the opportunity for choice. Also, the administrator argues that when a school or college faculty does undertake to formulate a uniform curriculum, pupil needs are not extraordinarily prominent in the deliberations; in such deliberations the several departments struggle over the possession of the pupil, and in the end each department makes off with whatever segment of his time and attention its strength and prestige have enabled it to capture. While neither of these methods of selecting educational experi-

¹Counts contends that because of lack of sequence true specialization is not accomplished "... the very frequent result is a scattering of student energies." G. S. Counts: *The American Road to Culture*, pp. 69 ff. New York: John Day Co., 1930.

ences is flawless, one advantage lies with the pupil-choice method in that there the pupil is at least the center of gravity.

The recent economic dislocation has given impetus to the kind of criticism cited. We have suddenly found ourselves apparently unable to afford all the good things we have. In the resulting campaign for economy the principle of the budget has been applied to the curriculum, and the question has been raised as to what should be eliminated. The pruning knife has been wielded here and there upon music and art and home economics and others of the newcomer subjects; and the scrutiny of the pruner is now intent upon those subjects in which enrollment is least.

It is probable that the criteria used to determine what shall be left out are less concerned with human problems than with length of past tenure. We are prone to a certain confusion in our reasoning about education; we are inclined to confuse culture with the traditional means to culture and to define education in terms of instructional materials rather than in terms of outcomes. Just now the phrase "fads and frills," after a period of retirement, has regained currency; it is extremely useful to those critics who substitute a contemptuous term for an argument.

It is not to be assumed that the critics of the differentiated curriculum are all from the ranks of the laymen. There are prominent and respected educators who charge that the significance of mental tests has been tremendously overrated; that the assumed differences between tests of mentality and tests of general achievement are not real; that to base discriminations upon intelligence scores is to be guilty of determinism and fatalism; and that upon an absolute scale human differences are neither as great nor as important as human similarities.² On the basis of this conviction that the so-called individual differences are only apparent or unnecessary or unimportant, they are disposed to regard curriculum differentiation as not necessary. There are both educators and laymen who contend that the justification of education at public expense extends only to that part of education which aims at *social integration* and at the *adjustment of the individual* to the world as he finds it. These two unmistakably primary problems, integration and adjustment, are more than enough to occupy the pupil throughout the secondary period. Thus the general serviceability which we have been

²W. C. Bagley: *Determinism in Education*. Baltimore: Warwick and York, 1925. See especially Chaps. I, II, and VIII.

trying to achieve for our curriculum through variety, they say, is rather to be attained through universality.

There are many thoughtful people who deplore what seems to be a lowering of standards in secondary education—a retrogression in “scholarship” with its commendable attributes of precision, thoroughness, continuity, and erudition. They feel that the differentiated curriculum, with its possibilities of frequent change of direction and its crediting of small units of learning, is responsible for a lamentable superficiality in its graduates. This question is unfortunately beclouded by a lack of objective evidence as to the levels of scholarship reached by secondary-school pupils under the older, more restrictive regime.

Some critics do not accept vocational considerations as a justification of the differentiated curriculum. They are disposed to discredit the vocational training given in the secondary school. Here a business man says that as between a pupil trained in the commercial courses and a graduate of the general curriculum he prefers to employ the latter. There an editor complains that the school-trained journalist does not fit into the world of the press, but has to be reëducated in the field. The school, however, does not know how to interpret such comments. There has been little analytical study of them. We do not know whether the business man has considered differences in native ability, or whether the editor's chief objection is perhaps to the young journalist's ideals, ideals that may fatally inhibit a certain ruthlessness which a newspaper career seems to demand. This kind of critic asserts that differentiation along vocational lines is ineffective and hence unjustifiable.

The Present Situation. Many secondary schools still offer either a single curriculum or one with very limited options. While, as noted later, the National Survey of Secondary Education discovered in the group studied no single-curriculum senior high schools in 1930-31, the lower grades of some junior high schools were found to be so organized. Since 1930 some school systems, under pressure of economic conditions, have gone back from highly differentiated programs to those in which the pupil has practically no choice. Besides inherent values which such a policy may have, there are psychological factors which promote it:

1. Popular respect for the traditional single curriculum, especially on the part of prominent citizens who think of themselves as its product.

2. The ease and convenience of the long-established practice.

3. The influence of vested interests, such as the writers and publishers of textbooks.

4. The tendency of teacher training institutions to perpetuate the *status quo* by means of emphasis upon established practice.

In the country as a whole, however, the practice of differentiation is startling in extent. The two most common methods of differentiation are (1) that which allows the pupil a choice of subjects or courses and (2) that which permits differences in rate of progress, in difficulty of subject-matter, and in supplementary lateral excursions into learning.

Under the former of these two methods there is a list of groups of subjects, called "courses" or "curricula," from which the pupil chooses; or there may be "constants," with a list of "electives" or "variables" with which the pupil completes his program. Combinations of the multiple-curriculum plan and the constants-with-variables plan are also used. Loomis, Lide, and Johnson present a list of 34 academic and 31 "special" subjects which are found in the various programs of studies of 60 selected junior high schools, and a similar list of 44 academic and 45 special subjects of 152 selected four-year and senior high schools. The number of units of work offered by the individual school is shown to be increasing; in the senior high school it ranges from 23 to 48. The single curriculum would offer 12 units in the senior high school, or 16 in the four-year high school. Thus the pupil who normally consumes 3 years in grades ten, eleven, and twelve might require from 12 to 15 years if he tried to complete all the subjects offered by his school. The group of senior and four-year high schools studied by Loomis, Lide, and Johnson did not afford in 1930-31 a single instance of a single curriculum, nor did the ninth grade of the selected junior high schools. It is only in the seventh grade that the single curriculum is typical. But, it should be remembered, only a small number of selected schools were studied.³

The second method of differentiation provides for differences in rate of progress. Billett reports that plans of ability grouping are found in all the states of the Union, and that in one state alone 234 schools are organized upon this

³A. K. Loomis, E. S. Lide, and B. L. Johnson: *The Program of Studies*; National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 19; pp. 38, 45, 126, 134, 138. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

principle. Seven hundred twenty-one schools testify that the plan is meeting with unusual success. Six hundred forty-eight schools are using some form of the Dalton Plan, 119 the Winnetka plan, and so on through the list of 28 methods of accommodating instruction to the individual pupil.⁴

It is evident that wide differentiation is characteristic of the American secondary-school curriculum. The school systems of the country seem committed to an effort to eliminate any maladjustment that is chargeable to differences among pupils. In small schools, however, this effort has never been carried very far. One fourth of our secondary school students are in schools with enrollments below 100. For them and for the students in schools slightly larger no material amount of differentiation is possible, and even in schools with enough students to make differentiation feasible there is often a single curriculum because it is easier to administer or more economical. When electives are offered, they are often much of a kind—for example, a choice between two foreign languages.

II. THE RISE OF THE PROBLEM

Closely related in a causal way to the wide differentiation of the secondary-school curriculum in contrast with the short list of offerings of the earlier high schools is the extraordinary increase in the enrollment of our secondary schools during the first thirty years of this century. While it is difficult to be exact in describing this increase, partly because of the various definitions of "secondary school" as the result of the 6-3-3 movement, there were about ten times as many pupils in 1930 as in 1900.⁵

Causes of Growth. There are at least five movements which have been major factors in this tremendous growth: (1) the growth of wealth in this country, a phenomenon which proceeded by accelerated motion from 1915 to 1929; (2) the growth of an ideal of universal education; (3) the development of the junior high school, beginning about 1910; (4) the intensive study of individual differences, stimulated by the ever-widening use of intelligence tests; (5) technological unemployment, which erupted with explosive force in 1929.

⁴R. O. Billett: *Provisions for Individual Differences, Marking, and Promotion*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 13; pp. 59, 267, 300. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

⁵G. N. Kefauver, V. H. Noll, and C. E. Drake: *The Secondary-School Population*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 4. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

The increase in wealth with its attendant rise in individual incomes enabled the father to provide for his family from his own wage and thus made it possible for him to offer the other members of the household, especially the children, a new leisure; accordingly more and more children had time for schooling, the apparent approach to a better station in life. The incidental expense of attending high school—for books, better clothing, extra-curricular activities—the family budget would now cover. And, equally important, the new affluence carried with it possibilities in the way of increased tax returns, so that the community found itself able to provide the additional facilities which the rush of recruits made necessary. Secondary education rapidly became a standard and universal luxury, succeeding the silk shirt and the player-piano and taking its place alongside the self-starter and the glass-enclosed automobile body. Thus the ideal of universal education extended its scope to include secondary education.

The junior high school devoted itself to the study of the early-adolescent. It developed into an institution in which the boy or girl could be more at home, more successful, and generally happier than his predecessors had been in the older types of school. Schooling became less and less an ordeal to be terminated as soon as possible and more and more an experience which offered limitless attractive possibilities. Even the very slow pupils, the former untouchables of the secondary school, found worth while classroom tasks with which they could cope; and many of them had the temerity to go on to the senior high school. Their modest successes in the junior high school generated a self-confidence and an ambition which resisted the corrosion of discouragement and took some through to graduation. To the junior high school goes much of the credit or the blame for the general willingness of adolescence to spend its time and energy in school.

The intelligence tests had the effect of throwing a brilliant light upon a pedagogical problem which had been as evasive as it had been irritating—the maladjustment of pupils to their tasks. While the precise nature of mental differences is still to be discovered, psychology has gone a long way toward the elimination of certain critical unknowns from the educational formula. Tests of mentality have revealed tremendous differences even among "normal" adolescents in capacity for learning. Survey, analysis, and experiment have already made possible a degree of consonance between

pupil and proffered educational experience which surpasses even the hopes of the child-study enthusiasts at the turn of the century. With this better relationship we are less and less inclined to suspect the adolescent of inherent laziness because of his failures; and we are more and more hopeful that he may come to exhibit the insatiable curiosity of his primer days, an attitude which beggars all kinds of synthetic motivation. As we progress toward this end, an increasing number of pupils give their allegiance to the secondary school and need no outside pressure to continue their membership there.

In the economic cataclysm of 1929 the typical wage earner and *pater-familias*, having his job unceremoniously taken away, reflected sorrowfully that it would now be necessary for the youngsters to drop out of school and help support the family. But he soon found that these were not that kind of hard times. The family needed food; but there was no need of anyone's going out to help produce food; there was plenty of that on hand. Clothing, shelter, fuel were abundant; they were merely inaccessible. When the children sought work they found opportunities extremely rare. They found, too, a hostility on the part of unemployed adults, and a generally accepted theory that adults with dependents had first lien on such jobs as might be available. After a period of scouting about, they turned up again in their old places in high school. There were many new faces in the school, boys and girls in their late teens, formerly wage earners but now just young people with time on their hands. And so the secondary school finds itself today an institution with less equipment, supplies, and help than heretofore, and more work than ever before to do.

To these influences the gradual extension of the period of compulsory school attendance, and the growing tendency on the part of employers to favor applicants with high school diplomas, added their bit in the direction of the popularization of secondary education. Out of it all has come a state of affairs in which going to high school is "the thing to do"; and, where formerly few enrolled, now few stay away.

Sources and Causes of Additions to the Curriculum. Those movements which have brought about the better adaptation of the secondary school to the nature and needs of its pupils, have themselves received a decided impetus from the very popularity which they produced. That is, the adaptation has increased the enrollment, and the increased enrollment in turn has created a need for better adaptation. The

pupils who make up this great increment are in certain important particulars different from those of the former student body. The old secondary school was a highly selective institution. In general, it attracted and retained only those boys and girls who found school work agreeable and reasonably easy. They were the kind who learned readily from books. Most of these newcomers are less linguistic in their ways of learning and doing. They are less at home in the realm of ideas; they are more in need of concomitant percepts in solving problems. They need more materials and apparatus and implements. Abstractions are more puzzling to them. They make less use of generalized experience. They are less able to deal with highly complex relationships. Their view of remote consequences is less reliable. They are less interested in scholarship than in finding out about the modern world. They need more help in discovering meanings. Many kinds of school activities have to be ingeniously motivated for them.

For these reasons the school has been forced to give full recognition to the non-academic subjects, to introduce new forms of both the academic and non-academic, and to vary content, method, and approach. Band, auto shop, home-making, typing, design, household accounting, and the like are offered and fully credited toward graduation; and in some schools there is little limitation upon the amount of such subjects to be credited. General mathematics, shop mathematics, general science, printing, and junior business practice, while also justifiable upon other grounds, are obviously more adaptable to the non-college type of pupil than are their respective correspondents in the earlier program of studies. The more obviously practical nature of these subjects not only makes them easier to understand, but also motivates them through probability of early use in familiar situations, personal, civic, or vocational.

The efforts of school officials to make the high school serve to some extent the peculiar needs and interests of the community have resulted in the addition of certain subjects. Agriculture is an excellent illustration. Salesmanship, furniture making, and auto mechanics as taught in the school are frequently reflections of prominent local industries.

Some of our curricular expansion is due to direct pressure from the public.⁶ Certain school subjects were first introduced at the request of groups organized about a common interest.

⁶Counts charges an alleged "low regard for intellectual achievement" to the fact that "the successful business man is the arbiter of educational enterprise in the United States to-day." *Op. cit.*, Chap. X.

For example, the first classes in fine arts were not the idea of school authorities; they were organized at the urging of manufacturers who saw the need for art in their products and who were embarrassed by the lack of it in attempting to compete with foreign manufacturers in local as well as foreign markets. The motive was thus commercial rather than cultural; the instruction was to benefit business rather than the individual. Its cost to the taxpayer was supposedly a good investment, and the fact that it added to the length of the cafeteria's bill of fare was not considered serious.

During the World War there was need for the conservation of our national resources for use in military operations. Both money and the things for which money is ordinarily spent by our people, were needed. Accordingly thrift as a personal virtue was given place among the attributes of patriotism. Gigantic thrift programs were imposed upon the schools as a part of the curriculum. The schools exerted their peculiarly effective influence, upon the younger children especially, and thousands of dollars daily poured into the banks as savings. After the War the banks took advantage of the momentum of this habit, and encouraged thrift campaigns in the schools.⁷ High-school banks were organized in the school buildings, serving depositors much as the ordinary banks do and using the local banks as depositories. Limiting one's own expenditures and entrusting the resulting savings to a bank was lauded as a habit closely linked to vocational success and to solvency after sixty. Here and there a farseeing school official taught children to think of a bank account and of savings in general as a means to prepare for effective spending; but the general practice was to teach saving for the sake of saving.

The fire insurance companies and the local fire departments are very active in their support of "fire prevention week" and other types of systematic instruction seeking to reduce fire losses. The annual losses in large units of territory are reported in multiple-digit numbers, to make this particular hazard seem to be the one most imminently threatening our

⁷A. Lewisohn: "How National Thrift Week Was Observed in the Schools of New Haven." *School Life*, XI, 5:98-100. (January, 1926). Mildred R. Wilkinson: "Effective Thrift Work by Parent-Teacher Associations." *School Life*, XII, 4:68. (December 1926). "The Bankers' Association, The National Thrift Committee of the Y. M. C. A. have both been instrumental in placing thrift in the schools through a banking system; and the local parent-teacher associations are helping in this work." A. H. Chamberlain: "Reports of Committee on Thrift Education". *Proceedings of National Education Association*, pp. 338-340. Washington: National Education Association, 1924. Mr. Chamberlain speaks of a national conference of about 150 organizations to promote thrift in the schools, including the American Bankers Association, the Savings Bank Division, and the National Chamber of Commerce.

national safety. The life insurance companies have shown a lively interest in instruction in health.

Besides these influences from commercial quarters, there are pressures from racial groups. German went out during the War; and now it is back, partly as a result of activity by aggressive groups of German descendents. The Atlantic Seaboard's interest in French, the determined efforts of the German-Americans to keep their language on a par with French, and the new current activities of the proponents of Italian tend to make international battleground of the American secondary school. Along the Mexican border the importance of the Mexican vote is reflected in the prominence of Spanish in the school program. In an occasional city, twenty years ago, could be found two foreign languages as a part of the public school curriculum from the fourth grade to the senior class. In one state there is a great racial interest in the question of the assignment of credit for the discovery of the American continent; and Leif Ericson Day in the schools precedes Columbus Day by seventy-two hours. The statutes provide that definite time be spent on that day in every public school in teaching the life and works of this adventurous Scandinavian.

There are social-progress groups which have secured legislation devoting definite periods of time to their respective causes—the ill effects of alcoholic liquors or of tobacco; the life and character of a famous exponent of this cause or that, the prevention of war, and so on.

The school is a ready-made organization for advertisement and propaganda, admirably adapted for reaching the minds of adults as well as children. It is not strange that various interests make of it whatever they can.

The growth of interest in continuation education and in the education of adults has given rise to types of schools which, though their students are beyond the traditional high-school age, must be classed as secondary schools. Publicly supported vocational schools, such as those of Wisconsin, and institutions primarily for adults, such as the Athenaeum and Mechanics Institute of Rochester, N. Y., are conspicuous examples. These schools, freed from the tyranny of credits and requirements, offer classes in any grouping of material which promises the student a more effective attack on his problems, personal, civic, or vocational.

The inclusion of these subjects in a summary of the

range of secondary-school offerings makes the simile of a gigantic cafeteria all the more appropriate.

III. THE ARGUMENTS

FOR THE COMMON CURRICULUM

The case for the common curriculum rests mainly upon need for integration, social and personal. It is supported by a variety of objections to the theory and practice of differentiation.

The Need for Integration. The investor who in 1928 thought of his bundle of securities as a means of commanding the services of other men for the rest of his life discovered in 1929 that those securities availed him nothing unless they had the good opinion of other men. And the wage earner who in 1928 looked out in complacency upon the land of plenty in which he lived learned in 1929 that a land of plenty can be converted into a land of sorrow and want without a change in the supply of material things. This experience is rapidly teaching the world the lesson of the critical importance of human relationships. The conviction is growing that integration of the nation and of society as a whole is paramount in the struggle for stable equilibrium in human well-being. The ancient principle "no man liveth to himself alone" is enjoying a marked revival of prestige.

It will be well to call attention at this point to four uses of the word "integration" which are prominent in educational discussion and which must be distinguished in the interest of clear thinking:

1. Social integration, or the unifying of the social group in the interest of social coöperation.
2. The intellectual integration of the individual; the coördination of his developed abilities for a maximally efficient unit.
3. The emotional integration of the individual; the complement of the individual's intellectual integration; the organization of his motives.
4. Integrated courses; cross-grouping of subject matter.

We are concerned here with the first three. The schools are in a position to contribute materially to the process of social integration by means of emphasis upon the learnings which people should have in common. Those neural patterns of the human individual which have counterparts in other

nervous systems are the agencies through which we understand and tolerate and help each other. It is fair to say, therefore, that the kind of education in which society is most interested, and which it is most willing to support, is nuclear and centripetal in character. For the secondary school, "the people's college," nothing is more appropriate than the kind of offering which we have called "constants."

Current economic conditions, by making us more conscious of our social problems, have inclined many people to the opinion that an all-important function of the public school system is indoctrination. Certain beliefs, loyalties and preferences should, it is said, be deliberately and thoroughly inculcated in order that the people may be oriented and unified in support of established institutions. This is a phase of social integration, with emphasis upon national unity.

The principle of competition in human endeavor comes in for a great deal of adverse comment in these uncomfortable times. To the spirit of competition is charged our lack of coöperation, and the schools are blamed for engendering this spirit.⁸ It is thought by many that by doing away with marks, awards, and honors we could develop in the young an attitude of mutual helpfulness that is sadly needed. Perhaps the thing that makes the slow pupil discontented in the traditional subjects is the array of practices which signalize his inferiority to the other pupils. It is possible that if in a common curriculum he could mark his success in terms of his own ability there would be no necessity, for the purpose of integration, to provide for him the relief materials which now make our curriculum so diverse.

The problem of the individual's adjustment to the total environment is yearly becoming more difficult and complex. Commonplace, taken-for-granted activities are more and more numerous; just to live is more and more of an achievement. Thus to develop the stock of common, essential personal equipment is an ever-increasing responsibility of the school. Perhaps we have reached the point where the secondary school can hope to accomplish no more than this universal training.

We are warned from time to time that nervous disorders are on the increase. This is said by some to be due in part to the unrestricted reproduction of inferior stock. On the other hand the circumstances of our modern life are said by others

⁸Counts claims that the American school "stimulates the competitive rather than the collective impulses." *Op. cit.*, pp. 74 ff.

to be conducive to neurosis.⁹ Unresolved conflicts in belief, desire, and impulse tend to disorganize thinking and produce acute emotional disturbances. It is possible that the secondary school, dealing with the period of heightened emotions, should go to much greater lengths to bring about the integration of personality. This emotional integration of the individual can perhaps be accomplished by identifying individual longings with the common good and by revealing the harmony between apparently divergent beliefs. If so, the importance of a basic curriculum is obvious.

Objections to Differentiation. The case for the common curriculum is supported by a variety of objections to the theory and practice of differentiation. One objection is that it requires the pupil to make choices of subjects on the basis of a meager background of experience, a limited view of the future, and other handicaps which hamper his judgment. There are critics who claim that the theoretical values of allowing the pupil to choose his curriculum are not realized in practice because the pupil is too immature, inexperienced and changeable to choose wisely. They contend that a better net result is obtained through a common curriculum wisely constructed by educators. Suppose, for example, that the pupil is trying to decide whether to study elementary algebra and plane geometry. Mathematics is a cumulative subject. If the pupil at some later time is to make a serious study of higher mathematics or engineering or certain branches of science, he cannot hope to do so on short notice; he must approach those studies with the mathematical foundation already laid. Since he cannot predict his later educational activities with any accuracy, they say, while he is still in the secondary school, it is essential that he make sure of the fundamental mathematics while he still has the opportunity.¹⁰ The same argument holds, to a lesser degree, perhaps, for other bodies of basic knowledge. The validity of such argument is, of course, dependent in part upon the decision as to what is to be substituted if the mathematics or other traditional subject is omitted.

Related to this objection is another contention. The highly specialized subjects of the elective list are by nature specific in their usefulness and are hence dependent for their

⁹For a popular discussion of the increase of neurotic troubles under the stress of modern life, see W. L. Brown: "Just Nerves." *North American Review*, 229:414-421. (April, 1930).

¹⁰The extreme to which this argument can be carried is illustrated by the statement that as women are increasingly going into architecture, all girls should be required to take high-school mathematics.

value upon specialized opportunities. The boy who learns shorthand must find a special kind of situation in which to use his ability. In building his training from electives he therefore stakes his future competence upon a by no means certain compatability between that training and the situations which later confront him. On the other hand, the broader training afforded by carefully constructed general courses provides a more widely applicable type of training. It is obvious that this kind of argument is closely involved with the question of the transfer of training, and its validity will be somewhat uncertain until that question is more nearly cleared up. A magnificent answer to the pedagog's prayer for a major aim and a *modus operandi* would be a generalized "ability to think" which could be developed from a few thinking experiences.

While there is general agreement that boys and girls should be retained in school through the early adolescent period, it is no longer necessary to sweeten or weaken the curriculum for that purpose. Unemployment, as already shown, has brought about an influx of youth to the secondary school. If we are to trust the predictions of the new economics, the future offers no probability of conditions under which children will be welcome in gainful occupations. The chances are that schooling will become more and more the standard occupation of the teens, and that the secondary school will be able, in making its program of study, to neglect educational salesmanship and to aim at instructional efficiency. If so, many of our present specialized courses will tend to disappear and thus promote the growth of a core curriculum.

Now that the cost of education has become a sore point, there is some feeling that the diversified curriculum has performed too well its function of attracting pupils; it is contended that by this means crowds of boys and girls are drawn into school who should not be there if they have to be enticed. Those who do not want the "solid subjects" which characterize the ordinary curriculum, it is said, should not attend. The surest method of increasing school costs is that of increasing the enrollment; let us not undertake added expense for pupils whose interest needs a hypodermic.

Another source of extra expense is found in small classes. The more diversified the offerings of the school, the more difficult it is to keep class size at an economical level. With all pupils working at a common curriculum, the regulation of class size would be a matter of simple division. The mobility

of our population also places a premium upon a common curriculum of standard units. Under this plan a pupil is able to transfer conveniently from one school system to another.

Training large numbers of boys and girls for white-collar jobs is an achievement of doubtful social value from the point of view of those who feel that there should be someone left to do the dirty work. The white-collar occupations are already over-crowded; there is too much disposition to avoid hard physical work and seek employment with a minimum of the odor of perspiration. Catering to the interests of children has a tendency to aggravate this impatient and intolerant attitude toward drudgery of any kind. There is some danger that we may bring up a generation of loafers, always on the hunt for something to do that promises entertainment and relaxation. In setting up new units in a differentiated curriculum there is always the experimental period in which values are in question and procedures are variable. Superficial and temporary considerations sometimes determine the goals as well as the methods, and there is a corresponding development of "flabbiness."

FOR DIFFERENTIATION

The case for the differentiated curriculum rests mainly on three grounds: (1) the inescapable fact of the range of individual differences; (2) the intellectual respectability of "interests"; and (3) the need for specialization.

Individual Differences. It is not necessary to attempt here a comprehensive discussion of mental differences. In the widespread use of intelligence tests in the past twenty years there have been some unwarranted assumptions, miscalculations, and misinterpretations, growing out of over-enthusiasm and overestimation. But there is a steady flame of truth and utility which tenaciously survives this mishandling. Here, it seems, we shall find the clue to the instructional parity which is the heart of democracy in education.¹¹ The following phases of the question are important to this issue:

1. Inheritance is a factor in mental differences. Similarities between members of the same family are found which are not explainable upon the grounds of training.¹²

¹¹See Bertran Russell: *Education and the Good Life*, p. 16. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.

¹²For examples of careful studies on these points, see the *Twenty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, especially F. N. Freeman, K. J. Holzinger, and B. C. Mitchell: "The Influence of the Environment on the Intelligence, School Achievement, and Conduct of Foster Children," Chap. IX. Also, Barbara S. Burks: "The Relative Influence of Nature and Nurture upon Mental Development," Chap. X. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Co., 1928.

2. Experience is a factor in mental differences.¹² Not only does fortunate experience increase the individual's ability to reveal his intelligence through the medium of a mental test, it also tends to improve that intelligence.

3. Mental differences between given individuals, which are evident at an early age, will not be minimized by educational experience. Such differences persist, and differences in achievement increase, so that need for a program of adaptation is greater in the secondary school than in the primary grades. Such differences must be faced, since we cannot hope that they will automatically disappear.

4. Superior mentality does not necessarily mean an advantage in learning all kinds of things.¹³ A task which is very simple, or one in which muscular control and coördination are prominent, puts little premium upon the kind of ability which is thought of as "intelligence." Learning French words to express familiar concepts or mastering a golf stroke or learning to type from copy is a kind of activity in which the "slow" pupil may hope to excel the "bright."

5. The more prominent the element of muscular coördination in a given learning problem, the smaller the advantage which superior intelligence implies.

6. The more complex the problem, the greater the advantage of superior intelligence.

7. Thorndike has distinguished intellectual intelligence, mechanical intelligence, and social intelligence. Stenquist has shown that the correlation between intellectual intelligence and mechanical intelligence is very low.¹⁴ That is, the intelligence tests reveal very little about mechanical intelligence. A very bright person may be of very high or very low mechanical intelligence.

8. Mental tests do not measure personality traits; they do not measure physiological factors. For example, differences in mentality may be compensated by differences in attitude or differences in energy. Mental tests reveal possibilities rather than make guarantees.

9. Differences in mentality manifest themselves in school work in ways which make very slow and very bright

¹²Examples of investigations contrasting the learning characteristics of bright and dull children are:

F. T. Wilson: *Learning of Bright and Dull Children*. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 292. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.

H. A. Carroll: *Generalization of Bright and Dull Children*. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 439. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1930.

¹⁴J. L. Stenquist: *Measurement of Mechanical Ability*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1923.

pupils seem like two different types of persons.¹⁵ For example, bright pupils are more able to profit by outlining and other forms of analysis; they are less willing to engage in drill exercises or other activities in which repetition or monotony is prominent; they generalize more effectively and solve problems more readily on the basis of generalized experience; real experience is most helpful to slow pupils, while vicarious experience, with its greater rapidity, economy, and accessibility, is most helpful to bright pupils; bright pupils like to devise their own attack upon a problem, while the slow require rather specific directions; supplementary reference materials are helpful to bright pupils and confusing to slow; slow pupils need encouragement, while bright ones need careful checking to prevent the superficiality which may result from speed; the bright excel at planning, while the slow can execute more effectively than they can plan; other things being equal, the social attitudes of the bright are usually better than those of the slow because they can more readily foresee ultimate consequences.

Thus there is evidently something involved beyond the simple question of the rights of the slow pupil. Those attitudes, abilities, and bodies of knowledge which the interests of society demand that he shall have will not become his through experiences, curricula, and methods, identical with those which are appropriate for the bright pupil. Secondary school teachers know less about this part of the problem than about the part with which they have had full experience. These new pupils, recent recruits to the secondary school, with their peculiar characteristics are a great puzzle. We have not accomplished a great deal in secondary education in the direction of devising educative experiences suitable for them. Perhaps the kinds of differentiation which our curriculum now exhibits are not highly successful; but it seems certain that the way to success lies through differentiation. Even those parts of the curriculum which are to be used by all pupils will require differences in method and in rate of progress.

One very strong reason for such differentiation is often overlooked in school programs. The school day, which constitutes the major part of the lives of a large fraction of our population, is a succession of tasks. The success of the individual pupil is measured in terms of victories over these

¹⁵For fuller discussion of these points, see H. H. Ryan and P. Crecelius: *Ability Grouping in the Junior High School*, Chaps. VI and XII. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1927.

tasks. Success is a strong stimulant; it is also one of the essentials to emotional well-being. People who are unsuccessful develop conflicts, complexes, neuroses, and even psychoses. Anti-social attitudes are found in pupils whose steady diet is defeat. It is important that the individual have his share of success. Our responsibility is for setting up a scheme of things in which it is reasonable to expect him to win a fair share of triumphs. This particular responsibility has no relation to the matter of his triumphs over other persons; it refers to the successful completion of learning tasks.

Interests. The second of the three chief grounds on which the case for the differentiated curriculum rests is the intellectual respectability of "interests." The word "interest," like so many other instances of educational terminology, has been so roughly handled by all kinds of theorists and experimenters that its meaning is uncertain. The doctrine of interest has been so loosely interpreted by some educational practioners as to set up schoolroom procedures which make the pupil's attack on any given problem capricious or even accidental. Even in some secondary schools, the whims of pupils have been invested with paramount importance, and care has been taken not to cross them lest something of initiative and self-direction be lost.¹⁶ Definite directions for procedure have been avoided in order that creative power might not be throttled. In the end the pupil, with his chronic attitude of "I dare the teacher to find something so interesting that I cannot avoid being interested in it" has become so irritating a human specimen that the stomachs of many persons, and especially of scholars, have been turned.¹⁷

No thoughtful exponent of the doctrine of interest has ever conceived of the term as synonymous with caprice, or desire for perpetual entertainment, or distaste for work, or impatience under sustained effort, or superficiality in any form. The doctrine of interest is based upon the principle that, except in play, voluntary human effort is normally directed toward some present or anticipated satisfaction. The adult whose behavior is characterized by purposeless activity is suspected of nervous disease. There is no reason to suppose that the adolescent is different from the rest of the population in this respect; nor to hope that for the convenience of

¹⁶See W. C. Bagley: *Education, Crime, and Social Progress*, Chaps. IV and V. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.

¹⁷"... The world in which we have to live and find our happiness is full of duties and opportunities which are far from being initially interesting, and the individual who has learned to react only to that which is self-motivated becomes a flabby incompetent in the world of realities." H. C. Morrison: *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School*, p. 104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.

teachers the adolescent can be weaned from this normal appetite; nor to believe that he would be improved by such a transformation if it were possible.

It may be set down as axiomatic that the secondary school pupil does act from purpose of some kind. Even those upon whom the habit of docile drudgery is strong would soon cleanse themselves of that habit if there were not ever-present objectives of some kind. It is true that those purposes may not be educational in nature; they may be of a decidedly inferior kind, such as escaping the wrath of teacher or parent, gaining the good opinion of the teacher, earning credits toward graduation, earning bonuses for good marks, outshining other pupils, impressing the object of affection, beating the record of a cousin, and so on through a long list.

The question is not whether the pupil shall act from purpose, but, rather, what kind of purposes shall move him. The secondary school must accept as one of its responsibilities the improvement of the pupil's list of purposes. Study that is motivated by the serviceable character of the thing studied is on a higher plane than that done from a sense of duty. It makes learning a direct outcome instead of a by-product. There is, of course, such a thing as learning for learning's sake; that is a thing which belongs definitely upon the play level, since it furnishes its own reward. But most of our learning jobs are not of that kind; they aim at something beyond the limits of the activity itself.

The bond between purpose and interest is intimate and universal. Interest implies a recognition of a relation to oneself; it grows out of purpose or it creates purpose. The interests of that adolescent may, of course, be mature or childish, beneficial or harmful, productive or idle, intellectual or materialistic. Raising the level of these interests is a part of our job; and healthy, cultivated interests are the motors of the effective learning apparatus.

The wide range of the legitimate interests of secondary school pupils, whether caused by native ability or by controlled or uncontrolled experiences, therefore, constitute a powerful argument for a variety of educational experiences. The theory of a planned society, for example, can be approached through water power, banking, limiting of farm acreage, retail codes, or political oratory. Shop mathematics strikes a spark in some minds, algebra in others, accounting in still others. Geometry seems worth while to one lad, mechanical drawing to another. An electric refrigerator may be a health

agency to one pupil, an exciting machine to another, a convenience to another, and a thing of beauty to another. Here is potential motive power to be developed and used.

Specialization. The third and last of the chief grounds upon which the case for differentiation rests is the social need for specialization. However inconvenient the varied interests and abilities of pupils may be when it comes to curriculum making, they are the roots of vocational and avocational specialization; from the standpoint of social welfare they deserve the fullest encouragement and development. On these kinds of variation we depend for extraordinary scholarship, skill, and research, and for the development of specialized abilities of all kinds to meet our infinitely varied needs. While a high degree of specialization on the secondary level can hardly be defended, some specialization must begin here if it is to begin at all. Even at the present peak of college enrollments, scarcely 10 per cent of our youth go on to college, and of these less than half continue beyond the first two years which are ordinarily assigned to secondary education.

Those who emphasize the need for integration of our population do not deny the need for specialization. The division of labor is characteristic of modern society, not only in the pursuit of material ends but in the attainment of all the other values which depend upon social coöperation. Even in the social life of families and communities each individual contributes his special understandings, appreciations, abilities, and information. Life would be insufferably dull without them. This sort of differentiation inevitably begins somewhere along the line, and since interests become more varied and more intense during adolescence, the secondary-school period is a favorable and appropriate time. Here vocational leanings are felt; the view of society and its institutions is broadening rapidly; social groups are forming and becoming active; life is becoming more a thing to be planned and less a thing to be taken as it comes. These individual tendencies must be carried beyond the point of vague leanings in one direction or another if society is to profit by them. All that education can do to foster and cultivate the special aptitudes and interests of each individual must be done within the period of secondary education for 95 per cent of our youth.

The significance of individual differences for curriculum making may be summed up in this way: from the standpoint of society these differences represent the possibility of a wide

range of specialized services upon which we depend for the successful conduct of a complex civilization and for the recession of its varied frontiers; from the standpoint of the individual the value of a given unit of instruction is dependent not only upon its relation to human problems and to other units of instruction but also, quite unmistakably, upon the nature of the learner. An experience that will nourish one mind will be indigestible to another. The equality of educational opportunity which democracy demands is not to be confused with identity of educational opportunity. This equality must be computed upon the whole formula of which the most important variable is the individual.

In meeting the objection of the cost of such a program we must not overlook the cost of crime, ignorance, nervous disease and other afflictions which are in part the result of lack of effective education. It is costly to carry out an ineffective plan of education no matter how cheap its maintenance may be. Another very practical consideration is that the support of the public schools is promoted by popular faith in the wide and equitable distribution of their benefits. Each obviously successful pupil brings his own personal constituency to the support of the schools.

The use of the secondary school exclusively as a period in which to care for common needs would be more tenable if we were able to foresee these needs clearly. But the accelerated motion which characterizes the times superannuates our institutions with confusing rapidity. Communication, transportation, street traffic, liquor sales, banks, industrial regulation, the map of the world, refrigeration, clothing and dozens of other things have undergone radical change during the present generation. Integrating subject-matter is soon out of date. It is not the part of wisdom to put all the educational eggs in that one basket, nor to stake the total value of that period of schooling upon a restricted field of shifting material.

IV. THE VERDICT

The issue rests upon the social need for integration and for specialization and upon the fact of individual differences in ability and in interest. The resolution of the issue must take into account all these factors and the objections to the theory and practice of differentiation.

Integration in the Differentiated Curriculum. The need for social and personal integration cannot be denied. It is a

mistake to assume, however, that such integration can be achieved by experience which is the same for all persons. Similar concepts, attitudes, abilities, and habits can be built up only through a variety of experiences suited to the interests and capacities of the learner. The adoption of a differentiated curriculum does not mean the repudiation of education's responsibility for social and personal integration. Such a curriculum will include a large section of materials directed specifically toward integration. The question is not whether integration shall be an aim; it is rather whether integration shall be the only aim. Differentiation of offerings can be made to serve both integration and specialization, while a common curriculum obviously cannot.

Specialization. The welfare of society is founded upon a variety of specialized services which its members render to each other, not only in the pursuit of material ends but in the quest of every value that society cherishes. Social life as well as economic life depends upon fostering and cultivating the special interests and capacities of individuals. The individual differences which are bewailed as pedagogical inconveniences are the ugly ducklings of the social scheme.

Individual Differences. The fact of individual differences in ability and in interest cannot be denied. No common curriculum is sufficiently flexible to cope with the vast range of these differences and to bring about a wide dissemination of educational benefits. This is true even when the desired outcomes are the same for all learners. After all is said and done, minds that are significantly different in capacity and in mode of operation require different kinds and amounts of assimilative material. Nothing is more important for emotional stability and balance than success. It is not necessary for all to attack the same problems, but it is necessary for all to have successful experience in solving problems. This kind of educational adaptation is tedious and challenging, but if we sincerely care more for the genuine growth of the individual than for standard lists of the traditional means to growth, the principle of differentiation must be accepted. The acceptance of the ideal of equality of opportunity also carries with it the obligation to provide differentiation. No single body of educational experiences represents equality of opportunity. Equality must be judged in terms of outcomes rather than in terms of materials.

Objections to Differentiation. The most common objec-

tion to adequate differentiation is the cost of such a program. Most of the bitter denunciation of this cost comes from those to whom it appears not as an investment but as an expense. The essential difference between these two categories is tremendous. Expense is a thing we constantly try to minimize; it smacks of waste. Investment we try earnestly to increase; it is an instrument of productivity. The man who expects nothing for himself from public education regards the cost as an expense; the man who expects a return of some kind thinks of it as an investment.¹⁸ The common curriculum and the differentiated curriculum cannot be compared as to cost without considering their respective contributions to the needs of society. Lack of education costs society dearly. The cost of adequate differentiation is somewhat mitigated by the fact that the differentiated curriculum, because of its varied content and breadth of view, lends itself to the practice of co-operating with churches, scout organizations, business houses, manufacturing concerns, and other agencies of the community which are able and willing to help. By availing itself of these services even the small school can provide experiences appropriate to the needs of most of its students.

Objections to the differentiated curriculum on grounds of the inability of pupils to choose wisely can be met by an adequate guidance program. The lowering of standards of scholarship for pupils who could never meet those standards is not to be deplored, but they may be held quite as severely to standards which are appropriate for them. Other limitations upon the differentiated curriculum will be discussed in the following section, but a decision in favor of the principle of differentiation seems inescapable.

V. LIMITATIONS

It goes without saying that no differentiated program can be thrown wide open to unlimited election. There must be safeguards in the way of guidance which will insure some degree of appropriate choice. Having instituted a policy of differentiation because of individual differences, we cannot optimistically ignore those differences or leave to chance the harmony between mind and task. The broadening of the fields of opportunity places a heavy responsibility upon administration and guidance.

¹⁸See T. H. Briggs: *The Great Investment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

The smaller the school, the greater the difficulties which it will encounter in carrying out a policy of differentiation. The smaller the teaching corps, the narrower the effective range of competent erudition. Small numbers of pupils, to be economically taught, must be limited to a narrow range of choice; otherwise per-capita costs get beyond the means of the community. Spaulding contends that school administrators have not fully explored the possibilities of the varied program and integrated curricula in the small school, and gives sample schedules to show some of these possibilities.¹⁹

A widely differentiated curriculum is always a source of greater expense than the uniform type. Some small classes are inevitable. A variety of educational equipment and supplies is more expensive than a simple list, since it makes more difficult the economy of quantity buying. At the present time this is a very important consideration, one which may postpone or limit differentiation in many localities.

The full possibilities of a differentiated curriculum will not be thoroughly explored until parents have learned to understand the prestige which they accord the standard subjects of their own school days. From force of habit they regard these subjects with almost scriptural reverence, and look with suspicion upon a proposal to omit or reorganize any of them. This feeling is recognized and encouraged by a great many members of college and university faculties.

College teachers have been slow to realize the full meaning of the fact that in these days a very small minority of secondary school pupils are destined for college work. In trying to visualize the typical high-school pupil and his educational needs, they are disposed to take the cue from young men and women who appear daily in their classes. They neglect the fact that these are not representative of the high-school population. Until there is a better understanding in this direction, the influence of the typical college professor will be thrown toward a narrow range of choice for the secondary-school pupil.

One consequence of this academic attitude is the tendency toward narrow specialization in the training of teachers. The prospective teacher gets little help in the direction of a comprehensive view of the needs of adolescence. He is daily encouraged to make a concentrated and undistracted study of first one narrowly circumscribed question and then another.

¹⁹F. T. Spaulding: "The Small Six-Year Secondary School." *Junior-Senior High-School Clearing House*, VIII:469-74 (April, 1934). See also articles by J. H. Highsmith and K. O. Broady in the same issue.

He is therefore handicapped in his later teaching by the lack of ability to see the whole picture and to contribute to the process of integration.

A varied program of studies creates other problems in teacher training. It is often necessary to assign two or more subjects in different fields to one teacher; this is very common in small schools. It is often difficult satisfactorily to fill such a combination position, especially if some particular ability in the extra-curricular field is also desired. These combinations are not standardized, and the teacher-training institutions cannot meet the problem directly by definite planning. It is not uncommon to find a teacher handling one subject in which he is a comparative novice. The importance of the teaching force in carrying out a differentiated program cannot be overestimated. The inertia of both classroom teachers and administrative officers constitutes a handicap that must be definitely reckoned with.

VI. THE ISSUE AND THE CURRICULUM

In harmony with this declaration for differentiation, the curriculum maker is faced with the difficult problem of offering society the greatest possible return upon its investment through the optimum development of all its pupil members in spite of the many ways in which they differ from each other. Questions like the following will arise. That they overlap in many instances is evident:

1. How late into the secondary school period shall constants extend?
2. Where shall differentiation begin?
3. What are the major fields in which differentiation is desirable?
4. How much alike, and how different, should the secondary school attempt to make pupils?
5. On what bases shall differentiation be made?
 - a. Brightness?
 - b. Mental maturity?
 - c. Achievement?
 - d. Social maturity?
 - e. Physical maturity?
 - f. Intellectual interest?
 - g. Vocational interest?
6. In what way shall the secondary school promote social and personal integration?

- a. By setting up a section of the curriculum which shall be identical for all pupils?
 - b. By setting up lists of desired outcomes—abilities, attitudes, and ideals—which all pupils should acquire, and varying the instruction for these purposes to fit the pupil?
7. Whatever the elements of secondary education which are to be provided for all pupils, how are these elements to be chosen?
- a. On the basis of their contribution to the stability of the social order?
 - b. On the basis of their contribution to an intelligently critical attitude toward the social order?
 - c. On the basis of their contribution to a common background of understandings?
 - d. On the basis of their contribution to common loyalties?
 - e. On the basis of their influence upon the mobilization of the citizenry in time of crisis?
 - f. On the basis of their value in preventing undesirable spiritual, moral, and physical contagion?
 - g. On the basis of their value in determining that the use of human artifices shall be helpful rather than harmful to the individual and to society?
 - h. On the basis of their value to the individual in his efforts at adjustment to the environment which is the world?
 - i. On the basis of obvious common needs?

These and many other questions must be satisfactorily answered as a prerequisite to the actual building of an adequate secondary curriculum. Many of them are discussed elsewhere in this report. Some of them can be answered only by careful experimentation.

ISSUE V

Shall secondary education include vocational training, or shall it be restricted to general education?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

A high standard of living in society depends to a large degree upon the productivity of the people. Social welfare therefore demands that every individual be prepared by some means to render specific vocational services to society. The welfare of the individual also demands it. Most people must turn to some work for livelihood, health, companionship, and for a central purpose in life to which they may relate their experience.

Few would dispute the need for vocational education as an essential part of one's equipment for life. But many would disagree on the manner in which it should be provided. The educational profession, in particular, is especially concerned with whether or not the secondary school should attempt to provide vocational education in the form of specialized training for occupations below the expert or professional level.

Many secondary schools have not waited for the issue to be settled on the basis of approved general principles. In response to the needs of boys and girls whose interests and whose prospects in life could not be served by the traditional academic curriculum, they have already enrolled over 1,000,000 boys, girls, and adults in specialized vocational courses.

The entry of the secondary schools into the field of vocational education has evoked sharp criticism from those who believe that the primary functions of the school are to promote the integration of pupils with society and to offer to them such social, economic, political, and moral education as is essential to good citizenship. They point to the defects in the present school programs of vocational education as sufficient evidence that training in specific vocational skills is not feasible or desirable in the secondary schools.

A careful evaluation of these objections to vocational education in the schools does not lead to the conclusion that training for vocational life should be omitted from the school

program. The schools' function of promoting social integration provides in itself a sufficient justification for including vocational training in the school program. The full integration of any generation of young people with society must certainly include a common conception of the part that various vocational activities play in the work of the world and a common readiness and preparation on the part of young people to enter into that work. No social agency apart from the schools has as yet demonstrated its ability to provide youth with this type of vocational preparation. Those who doubt also if the schools can provide it should view the defects in the schools' programs for vocational education in the light of the rapid and encouraging progress made in them since their inception.

A careful evaluation of the objections to vocational education in the schools does point, however, to important modifications in the programs of vocational education which the schools now offer. The very defects which critics point to suggest the specifications for a dynamic program of vocational education such as outlined herein. This program, or one like it, would be as practicable as our present knowledge makes possible. Educators can accept it as an intelligent resolution of the issue on which to base their future work in the field of vocational education.

I. THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

The Issue Defined. Readers of this discussion should keep in mind the definition of secondary education adopted in the Introduction of this report. Vocational education is here used to include all activities directed by schools for the specific purpose of preparing individuals for successful participation in different fields of service. General education is here used to refer to all other activities directed by schools: namely, those which do not have reference to the particular fields of service in which individuals hope to engage. General education may promote a general increase in vocational competence through greater social maturity, more effective ways of thinking, a better command of language, and the like; it may make individuals better citizens in industry through an enlightened social consciousness specifically directed toward the problems of industry, the relations of capital and labor, and the reconstruction of the economic order; but it does not differentiate among individuals as to the particular needs of

society for which they will attempt to provide. Wherever educational activities provide different training for individuals according to the different fields of service in which they plan to engage, we have to do with vocational education.

This definition of vocational education excludes certain general courses in occupations, certain techniques of occupational analysis and certain aspects of guidance which are commonly offered as means of increasing the vocational competence of all pupils alike. The intention is not to deprecate these offerings nor to question this extension of the concept of vocational education in common usage, but to sharpen the issue. Educational activities in which all pupils participate as a necessary part of their general orientation and adjustment may fairly be called general education, for purposes of philosophic discussion, even though their subject matter is the work of our society. The inclusion of such activities in programs of general education is fairly common and not widely questioned. The question at issue is whether specialized education to prepare pupils directly for successful participation in various occupations should be introduced or retained in the secondary-school curriculum. If the present discussion declared in favor of vocational education, having in mind only the general, undifferentiated program for occupational adjustment which is offered as vocational education in many schools, this issue would not be met. In the interests of clarity, therefore, the definition of vocational education adopted in this discussion deliberately excludes activities which might be regarded either as general education or as contributing to vocational competence of all pupils alike. Whether they should be called one or the other in common usage it does not attempt to decide. The intention is only to classify them as general education in the present discussion.

It can hardly be disputed that every individual should be educated somewhere for successful participation in a particular field of service to society. Such participation is desirable no less for one's personal happiness than for the best interests of society. Regular employment is conducive to mental and physical health, and makes one better adjusted in a society of individuals who are similarly employed. It furnishes the satisfaction of constructive achievement, of social recognition, of security and success. It provides a central point of reference by which an individual takes hold of the world and makes it meaningful. The activities of his fellows assume significance in the light of his experience as a worker no

less than in the light of his civic, domestic, or recreational experience. Growing competence in a vocation is an intellectual tool for making sense of the cosmos as well as the discipline of science or philosophy. The doctor's view of life is significantly colored by his experience as a doctor; the educator certainly sees life in terms of education; even the garage mechanic has his own set of symbols, his own apperceptive background, through which the objects and events of his daily experience assumes order and significance. Without an occupation man is bereft not only of security, health, and companionship; he is bereft of a central purpose to which he may relate his experience. His vocation is the basis of his intellectual life.

The social need for participation in a particular field of service is equally apparent. If we are to live at all, we must have such goods and services as food, clothing, shelter, tools, transportation, communication, recreation, labor, finance, control, and the like. If we are to live abundantly, we must so order our quest for these primary necessities as to achieve such values as security, justice, freedom, variety, truth, beauty, love, and health. To attain these things we have built up with the toil and thought of countless generations a vast, intricate social organization, facilities for every kind of production, distribution and consumption, and the great cultural and technical heritage of civilization. These are our only means of maintaining life and all the values we cherish. They must be kept in order and constantly improved if our civilization is to continue. They will not run themselves automatically; on the contrary they are constantly breaking down and lagging behind the increasing demands of society. A single generation which failed to learn how to maintain and improve them would inevitably perish, and civilization with it. Hence our concern that all should be educated sufficiently and in such fashion as to secure their intelligent, responsible participation in this great coöperative endeavor of society to provide for the needs of all its members.

The number of fields of service for which individuals may be educated is relatively limited, although the specific jobs within these fields range into thousands, depending on the criteria of classification. The education necessary for successful participation in these fields varies in kind and amount, but some education is required for all. Even in the so-called "unskilled" occupations it is unquestionably true

that "there are tricks to all trades." Anyone who has tried to dig a post-hole will appreciate that considerable skill is required to handle the "digger" efficiently. It may be granted that the surgeon needs more training than the janitor who takes care of his offices, but it will not be denied that some kind of training for the latter individual is also desirable. Training is required for every vocation, and such training is a charge that society in one way or another must ultimately pay. No one disputes that it should be given adequately, effectively, and economically. The issue is whether training for occupations below the expert and professional level should be provided in part by secondary schools or under their direct supervision, or whether such training should be provided entirely by non-school agencies, leaving the individual and this agency jointly responsible to society for its effectiveness.

The Present Situation. Specialized vocational training is extensively provided by secondary schools as a matter of long-established national, state, and local policy. For the past several years the enrollment in specialized vocational courses in secondary schools has exceeded 1,000,000 boys, girls, and adults. To these must be added the vastly greater number of pupils enrolled in college preparatory courses of definitely vocational character. The issue as to whether such training should be included as a normal and necessary part of any program of secondary education is still acute, however, in schools of moderate and small enrollment. It may fairly be said that the average secondary school in the United States is still content with a program which it regards as general education. When a school lacks funds to provide both vocational education and the courses commonly prescribed for admission to college, it will almost invariably prefer to offer the courses prescribed for college entrance, even though only a small per cent of its pupils go to college and a far higher per cent go to work. Such a procedure is warmly defended as the only "practicable" program under the circumstances. While this discrepancy exists, it will still be profitable to discuss the place of vocational education in secondary education, even though educational leaders have argued in its behalf for the past twenty-five years or more. It is still an issue among the rank and file of American secondary schools.

Even when the schools, long dominated by the college viewpoint, have introduced vocational education, they very commonly do not pretend to make any comprehensive attack on the problem of training young people to carry on the work

of our society. Instead they offer a few commercial and "practical arts" courses largely for the purpose of finding something to interest pupils who are obviously unfitted for the training of scholars and scientists. Valuable as these courses may be for adjustment purposes, they usually offer sadly inadequate training even for the fields whose names they bear, and none at all for the vocations which the great majority of their students will follow. The presence of so many half-hearted attempts at vocational education in secondary schools offers still another reason for examining afresh the arguments for and against the inclusion of a comprehensive program of vocational education in practically every secondary school in the land.

II. THE ARGUMENT FOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The Need Is Great. Those who believe in vocational training on the secondary school level point to the need for it and therefore conclude that some agency of society should provide it. They argue that the public secondary school is the one and only agency in our society which has been created with the purpose of training all its prospective citizens above the elementary-school level and that this institution, therefore, is the one upon which this responsibility of vocational training can best be placed. They also summon to their side the negative argument that no other agency of society provides this kind of training for all individuals and consequently the secondary school should assume the responsibility.

Proponents of vocational training on the secondary school level point with much concern to the statistics that reveal a tremendous amount of shifting of employees from one kind of job to another. Because so many of the employed change their vocations each year, and many adults seem never to find work in which they are successful or happy, it is argued that such lamentable and wasteful conditions would be ameliorated if individuals were provided proper vocational training, including skilled guidance. A common conclusion is, therefore, that secondary schools should provide the necessary training.

A phenomenon used to support the argument for vocational training in the secondary school is the astounding increase in enrollment and the persistence in school of youth of all kinds. As great as this increase has been in the past, it has by no means reached the maximum, for all social and

economic changes, the slow moving trends as well as the radical ones of the past two years or more, are forcing youth out of employment and into the schools. It has already been argued, in the discussion of Issue I, that no longer can secondary education in the United States be considered primarily as training youth for leadership; more and more in the future it must attempt the promotion of the talents, whatever they may be, of every individual.

Hitherto and traditionally our secondary schools have catered chiefly to the class who would enter upon the professions, at least upon the so-called higher vocations, or who would supposedly live lives cultured in the academic sense. They still serve both the vocational and the avocational interests of these classes more directly and adequately than they do the interests of the new type of youth so rapidly increasing in numbers. Obviously if the spirit of democracy is to prevail, this is unfair. We hold that every youth has a right to the appropriate development of his own peculiar powers, whatever by nature or by nurture they may be. Those who are not likely to have the advantages of further schooling have a right, which it is to the interest of democracy that they should have, to the kind of training that will help them to be successful, intelligent, and happy wage earners and citizens. There has been up to the present time an over-emphasis on the desirability and even on the superiority of white-collar jobs, and there has not been enough understanding and respect engendered for other types of vocational employment.

It is further contended that early selection of a vocation and subsequent training for it powerfully motivates an individual's entire educational experience, that by finding meaning in the closely related courses he learns to put forth more effort and more intelligently effective effort on all of his studies. Certainly the earlier in life he begins his vocational preparation, the farther it can be advanced. If he can be convinced of its worth, he probably will remain in school long enough to get at the same time adequate general education, which without adequate motivation would have otherwise have meant little to him.

The School the Most Effective Agency for Vocational Training. The necessity for vocational education is further supported by the contention that it is becoming increasingly difficult—in many lines of employment impossible—for the worker to learn his trade on the job as an apprentice or

learner. The technical progress of our society makes necessary for many occupations theoretical and technical training which the worker on the job is often not qualified to give to the apprentice. This is strikingly true in industry, but it is also true even in such traditional occupations as agriculture and home-making. In agriculture, with the government spending millions of dollars each year for scientific research, the farm boy cannot hope to succeed if he goes on farming in the way in which his father has always farmed. The father cannot teach his son what he himself does not know. The school is the most effective and economical way, it is argued, for teaching both the boy and his father the rapidly accumulating results of scientific research in agriculture. Printed materials alone cannot put this research to immediate and effective use. In home-making also the care of the sick, child care and education, feeding and clothing the family, sanitation, recreation, and family relationships are no longer a matter of carrying on the old patterns. The mother is helpless to teach the daughter what she herself does not know, and again the school is indicated as the most effective and economical educational agency.

Another contention is that public control of vocational training is necessary to safeguard the interests of society, and especially those of young workers who are seeking to establish themselves in wage-earning positions. Employers of labor operate under pressure of economic competition which is indifferent to the interests of young learners or apprentices. In the past this has led to exploitation of child labor and of even adult learners. The individual employer, pressed by his competitors, is helpless to remedy the situation even though he may be disposed as an individual to protect the young worker. Organized labor, on the other hand, is interested in restricting the supply of labor in each trade by setting up barriers to entrance into the trade. Both employers and organized labor recognize the danger of leaving vocational education under the private control of either employers or labor. In 1917 they united in the demand that all vocational training of secondary-school grade under the Vocational Education Act be under public supervision and control to avoid exploitation and to safeguard their own interests, the interests of the learner, and the interests of the public.

The "consumer value" of vocational education is also alleged in its behalf. Even if the pupil does not follow the occupation for which he was trained, he retains valuable

standards of appreciation in a field in which his interest is likely to continue. The student in a well-taught class in wood-working, for example, should be able to recognize good materials and good workmanship; he should know how to purchase and to care for good furniture, and take pride in so doing; and these standards of appreciation should transfer in some measure to related products and fields of endeavor. Some outcome of consumer interest and knowledge may be expected from almost any sound vocational experience in school whether or not the occupation is actually pursued.

It is also argued that the school is the only impartial educational agency under direct social control, amenable to the direction of intelligent planning, which can explore the possibilities of a wide range of occupations, promote an intelligent choice among them with only the interests of society and of the pupil in view, train the pupil in the theoretical, social, and technical background of the occupation chosen, and enlist his understanding loyalty in the service of his society as well as in the service of his employer, his family, and himself.

III. THE ARGUMENT AGAINST VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

General Education More Important. It has been argued in the discussion of Issue III that the interests of society in the program of free public education should be paramount, but necessarily these interests must be realized in terms of every individual's own development. When planning for that, it is necessary to make an analysis of what citizens do in all phases of their lives and to prophesy what each individual is likely to do. Such analysis and prophecy inevitably include much more than vocational activity. Although that is of concern to society, it is commonly thought to be of far more importance to the individual, and may be learned in due time by the individual's own efforts aided by those of the employer. Many of the other activities of all citizens important to society will be learned imperfectly or not at all unless they form an integral part of the school program. The primary obligation of the school, it is argued, is to provide a program that insures the social, cultural, moral, civic, political, and economic education of each and every citizen. Nothing should be allowed to impair this program. It should train the individual in civic, social, and political responsibilities, imbue him with the idea and ideals of moral worth, make it possible

for him to adjust himself socially and economically, and make him both willing and able to contribute his best to society in each of these fields.

Recent developments of civilization have greatly emphasized the importance of general education for all citizens in the United States. What may have been adequate a generation or more ago no longer suffices. Knowledge that was formerly peculiar to specialists is now available to the masses; the more widely it is possessed, the more important for everyone to share it. This is one source of intellectual integration. Travel has so increased, communication has been so improved, libraries so multiplied in number, and the reproduction of art and music so nearly perfected that the possessions of mankind can be shared as never before. And the very size of the world in which one lives has by these means been vastly extended. These considerations have led many to the conclusion that general education must be considerably extended for even the necessary knowledge, attitudes, ideals, and appreciations to be imparted. Vocational training should not be allowed to interfere with these important objectives. It can probably be safely postponed, it is argued, until after secondary education has made an attempt to achieve the purposes of general education.

Defects in Programs of Vocational Training. A program of vocational training is said to assume that an early decision as to what each individual will do to earn a livelihood can safely be made. Most pupils in the secondary school are too immature to make wise vocational choices, and subsequent training based on such choices are far too likely to be inimical to the welfare of the individual and to the best interests of society.¹ Specialized training founded upon such a selection may result in an individual's finding himself later on a road from which there is no economical escape, or launched upon a vocation in which he has no real interest. It is admitted that certain advantages would accrue from an early knowledge of what vocation a pupil will follow; but it is denied that at present we have any reliable means of making an accurate forecast for the majority of youth. Therefore, it seems to many that the counsel of wisdom is to continue general education, made as assuredly valuable as possible, until such prophecy is known to be reasonably sound.

¹G. N. Kefauver, V. H. Noll, and C. E. Drake: *Comprehensive and Specialized Schools*, National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 2, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1927, No. 17.

There is a psychological factor also to be considered. Youth is characterized by its short span of interest, by its inability to take a long view. If adolescents early determine their future vocations and are given training that will enable them to become immediate wage earners, some think they are likely to take the short-cut to economic independence, as they see it, and thus sacrifice greater life values. The prospects of having a few dollars in his pocket will oftentimes cause a boy to discount the value of a longer period of training only to awaken, when too late, to bitter disappointment over his immature choice. Secondary education should not create a situation that makes possible such unfortunate results.

It is pointed out that most individuals are fitted by nature to succeed equally well in any one of several vocations. Except for rare instances of unusual abilities or handicaps, it seems untenable to maintain that there is one vocation and only one for which a given individual is preordained. The broader his general training, the more likely his success in the vocation he eventually enters. For the normal person success in a vocation seems to depend as much upon other factors such as interest and desire to succeed as upon native abilities and aptitudes and training.

Another objection to the proposals for vocational training in secondary schools is the apparent uncertainty and confusion which seems to exist as to just what should be included in a given vocational curriculum. Outside of specific skills necessary for success in certain vocations, skills which often change with the times, no one seems to know just what content material should be offered in a specific curriculum of this kind. This has resulted in contests between subject specialists, compromises, guesses, and the like, to the extent that actual curricula as organized and developed do not accomplish their avowed purposes and are resolved, in fact, to generalized curricula with the limits somewhat narrowed. Whether a satisfactory vocational curriculum can be made or not has a grave doubt cast upon it in the opinion of many because of the fact that attempts up to this time have not been particularly satisfying.

It is held that experiments in organizing secondary-school curricula with vocational objectives have not proved successful. This lack of success is due to several insurmountable causes, involving human nature itself. These experiments are said to show that adolescents have no experience background which helps them materially in making valid

choices of curricula of this kind. Their choices are frequently founded on data and experiences that are often misunderstood and as often misinterpreted, on emotional reactions, or are made to conform to the influence of some other person—parent, friend, or teacher.

Because he likes to tinker with things, one child chooses to prepare for engineering, when perhaps he should be a mechanic. Another chooses to be an aviator because some one in that vocation is his hero or the dramatic aspects of the vocation attract him. A third chooses to follow his father's vocation because it offers a haven to him, or he declines to enter his father's business because at home he has seen and heard too much of the disagreeable aspects of it. Still another child chooses to be a lawyer or physician in order to please a father who himself was thwarted in his own ambition and wishes to realize it in the career of his son. In addition, many adolescents are easily influenced by the social phases of the school situation and will choose a certain curriculum because it is the thing to do in that school or in order to be with his friends. Illustrations of this type are offered in numbers by those opposed to vocational education in secondary schools to show how easily and how often a child may be led to select a vocational curriculum not suited to his real self at all if the choice is made, as it generally has to be, before his real abilities and valid yearnings have had a chance to become dominant factors in his choosing. The net result of this scheme is a great number of individuals more poorly adjusted to life in many ways than if they had not been forced to accept this kind of training.

Even if there could be developed curricula that actually prove worthy as means of specialized vocational training, it is claimed that the incorporation of such in the program of the average secondary school would be impractical. The argument is that the ultimate of this scheme, if it were to serve democratic ideals, would be that a vocationalized curriculum should be provided to serve the specific needs of each and every pupil. This would be so expensive that society would not pay the bill. Consequently, it is argued, compromises and modifications would inevitably result to the extent that the professed ideal would be sacrificed. If vocational training can not be provided for all, it is manifestly unfair to provide it for some, who thus are unduly favored by society.

There is also considerable confusion as to what "practical" education is. What is practical to one is not necessarily practical to another, whatever definition is given to the term. All depends on one's experiences and prospects. The most abstract course in a foreign language might prove practical to one person while a "practical" course in shop might be far from his experience or probable needs. Figuring the excavation of a cellar may be just as abstract to a pupil without background experience as a theoretical problem in literal algebra. In the most general curriculum there is inevitably much that will, in one sense or another, prove practical to some pupils; and with better planning there will be more.

Although as has been said before, vocational effectiveness is contributory to the social ideal, it is more immediately and directly profitable to the individual and to the industry that employs him. It seems only reasonable, therefore, that after society has provided general education, which is fundamental to practically every occupation as well as important to the State, the individual and industry should share the cost of the training that fits him to be skillfully productive. However, it is admitted that such training is frequently narrow in scope and may easily lead the individual into a blind alley. Under such circumstances it is society's obligation to protect the individual by some means against such exploitation.

It is contended that it is neither necessary nor practical for the secondary school to train an individual to a high degree of vocational skill prior to his entering employment. Moreover, the larger industries and some of the smaller ones prefer to give this specific training themselves to youth who have a good foundation of general training. Mr. Frank Jewett, Vice-President of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, expressed this position in an address before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Although he betrays too much faith in the disciplinary psychology, his opinion is representative of that of many successful men of business. He said, in part:

We have relatively little use for detail technique acquired at the expense of more fundamental mind training. Business itself is quite competent to provide the details of training in the technique of its operation. True, it may be of some help to us in some directions to have boys and girls enter our ranks with a rudimentary knowledge of certain kinds of technique. We do quarrel with you if you carry this kind of training too far in amount and diversity and so deprive your product of the capacity to advance in after-life for lack of suitable training of the mind, which you alone of the secondary schools have the opportunity to give.

The attitude here expressed has led certain engineering colleges during recent years to offer more general types of training and to place less emphasis on the development of specifically trained technicians. Colleges of law and medicine have long done this to some extent and are reported to be moving still further in this direction. Examination of curricula of many colleges of business administration reveals a similar trend. If this policy is sound on the college level, it is argued that it should be even more defensible for the secondary school. A possible exception may be made of youth preparing with some certainty for the lowest-level occupations.

The opponents of vocational training in secondary schools point to another obstacle which has been revealed in the organization of trade training. Methods and machinery have changed so rapidly that it has been an experience that those pursuing a course of some duration in learning to use some machines have found when they were ready to take a job that the machines they learned to operate have been scrapped in industry. Even if it were possible, as it probably is in theory, for educators to keep informed as to these changes, the expense involved in replacement of machinery is much more than society could and should bear. In fairness it is admitted that such radical change is not the rule and that training on old machines probably facilitates learning to use new ones of a similar kind.

One argument for vocational training is that it reduces the shifting of occupations of adults, but it may be contended that some changes of vocation are inevitable and even desirable and that vocational training should not attempt to eliminate this condition even if it could. They say that changing of occupations among adults is inevitable under present conditions. Old industries die out, new ones come into existence, and progress and change are a feature of our industrial order. Consequently, there will be a degree of shifting among the workers in spite of whatever kind and quantity of vocational training we have in our schools. Further, improvement of one's status in life is one of the ideals of democracy and this often means vocational changes. Perhaps this argues for development of some method of teaching techniques of adaptation to change.

This problem of adjustment to our rapidly changing society does not seem to be one of intellectual and skill training only. Satisfactory attitudes toward change also seem

necessary. The experience of some of those who have been engaged in unemployment relief during the recent depression is cited to show the lack of proper emotionalized attitudes as being one of the greatest problems. This has been particularly reflected in the white-collar class who, although offered other employment different in kind from that in which they had been engaged, thwarted all attempts to do much for them because of their attitude that they "*couldn't* do anything else." This inflexibility may or may not be a concomitant of a high degree of specialization, inasmuch as these workers were probably the product of the present program of general education. It is, however, a barrier to proper adjustment and should be reckoned with in any educational plan.

This all seems to argue for training in secondary schools in power and adaptability rather than in highly developed vocational skills. Supporters of general education claim that the apparent need of specific vocational training is really an evidence that provisions for general education in our schools are inadequate. Support for this argument is found by many in the results of Brewer's analysis of why workers lose their jobs. His findings are that more workers lose their jobs because of inability to get along with people than because of lack of specific vocational skills.

IV. THE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUE

The arguments on both sides of this issue have been presented with what is hoped will be considered impartial fairness, even when the argument has not seemed to the Committee to be sound. The fact should no longer be concealed, however, that it is the argument against vocational education which seems to the Committee to be unsound. The idea, for example, that since life consists of more than one's work, these other things should have the right of way in education over everything that pertains to work is thoroughly fallacious. Work should have its due place, and this place is not to be postponed until everything else has been cared for. To do this would not only deprive the great majority of youth of vocational training, but it would deprive them of the contribution which vocational education can make to their social, moral, civic, economic, and cultural education.

The Arguments Against Vocational Education Refuted.
The idea that vocational education assumes that "an early

decision as to what each individual will do to earn a livelihood can safely be made" is untrue. No such assumption underlies vocational programs. They must meet the needs of youth who do in fact and very commonly must of necessity make an early choice, whether or not such choice can most wisely be made. When an early choice is unnecessary, the program contemplated in this discussion will endeavor only to build interest and capacity in a broad field of service to society, postponing preparation for a specific job as long as possible. The bogey of assigning pupils arbitrarily to economics classes through the injudicious use of vocational aptitude tests need not alarm any educator who has overcome his fear of witches. Such a conception of vocational guidance is as unfounded, irrational, and ignorant as a belief in the old myth of ritual murder by the Jews. Aptitude plays a relatively minor role in vocational choices; the essential element is interest, built up through years of thoughtful exploration of a field of service. Where such an interest and background exists, pupils are likely to find employment at some point within the field of their deliberate choice. Where it does not exist, they must take what comes. Many educators point to the fact that most people at present must take whatever jobs are offered them, as though this were desirable or inevitable. They draw no such conclusion when it is reported that the average American adult reads less than one book a year. They determine to remedy this deplorable condition as quickly as possible. The present purposeless drift into occupations is even more deplorable, and is directly related to the absence of educational provisions for vocational guidance in the past. A determined effort on the part of American secondary education to remedy this deplorable condition through building interests and capacities in broad fields of service would add immeasurably to the happiness of the American people.

A further refutation of the bogey of early vocational choices is the *tu quoque* argument. Pupils make educational choices continually: elective courses, extra-curricular activities, projects, books, magazines, newspapers, movies, radio programs, and the like. No one rises to assert that pupils are too young to make such choices. It is taken for granted that such choices must be made if education is to proceed, and that through a long series of such choices, under supervision but with many chances for error, pupils may learn to choose wisely. It is unreasonable that the same opportunity should

be denied them in the most important choice of all. The choice of a vocation is not wisely made all at once: it is the result of a long series of decisions through which the ultimate choice becomes progressively more refined, definite, and certain. The same provision for guiding these choices should be made as for the guidance of educational choices—especially since so many educational choices are made on the basis of some thoughtless, imagined, unguided vocational goal.

The argument that vocational education may lead youth to enter employment earlier than they otherwise could to their subsequent regret may be met by the equal and opposing argument that great and increasing numbers of young people in our high schools are obviously unfitted for the training of scholars and scientists, and are goaded to the point of rebellion by academic courses in which they have no interest or capacity. It is impossible to retain these pupils in school except by introducing into the program some element in which they can succeed, and in which they see some point. With such provision they may be induced to broaden their general education as well.

Exception must also be taken to the statement, "Whether a satisfactory vocational curriculum can be made or not has a grave doubt cast upon it because of the fact that attempts up to this time have not been particularly satisfying." It is probably true that vocational curricula as developed in secondary schools only during the last two decades are not "particularly satisfying" to those who do not believe in vocational training in secondary schools. For those who believe in such training, the developed curricula demonstrate conclusively the feasibility of providing worth while vocational education in almost every secondary school in the land. Even the most sanguine advocates of vocational training in 1917, when our national program was initiated, could not have expected that it would succeed in realizing its objectives during the following eighteen years to the extent that it has. This general reply may be made to several other sections of the argument against vocational education which cast aspersions on its present achievement.

The testimony of successful business men against vocational education should not be taken too seriously. They succeeded for the most part in spite of their own lack of vocational preparation, and for that reason they may tend to minimize its importance. Their testimony is usually elicited on occasions when they have been invited to address some

academic gathering, such as a commencement exercise, when everything disposes them to say a few kind words in behalf of the academic education which they received, and which in their kindly recollection made them what they are. Furthermore it may be contended that a broad and thorough study of a field of service, endeavoring to understand what needs of society it ought to serve, what resources, equipment, personnel, and technology are available to serve these needs, why they are served so badly, on the whole, at the present time, and what promising lines of improvement the industry might undertake, while exceedingly desirable from the point of view of the interests of society would not serve the special interests of the employing class. They might not want their workers to become too intelligent about the direction and control of our economic system, to be aware of possibilities of improvement which would subordinate the interests of the employing class to the welfare of society as a whole, or to understand too clearly for whose interests the present system is administered. In this matter teachers have a moral obligation to stand for the interests of society as a whole, rather than for the interests of a special class. They are not the hired hands of successful business men to do their bidding in the matter of vocational education. Even when the admonitions of such men are kindly and sympathetic, they usually have in view how to enable children to become what they are. They do not talk about the larger responsibilities of vocational education: to serve better the needs of society, to ameliorate the condition of all workers, whatever their station, and to make all work more meaningful, more thoughtful, more conscious of social responsibilities, more joyous, more adventurous, more creative. The conventional ideal of "success" is a mark of cultural immaturity. If vocational education, according to the testimony of successful business men, does not minister to this ideal, so much the better. It will increasingly be a point of honor not to succeed at the expense of one's fellow men, but to cooperate intelligently and responsibly with them in providing ever more adequately for the needs of all.

The argument against vocational education also implies that the present system, whereby the great majority of pupils do not enter a field of service to society with full consciousness of its responsibilities and problems, but drift into "openings," obey orders, and make what money they can, is desirable. The argument asserts in so many words that pupils somehow adjust to the workaday world without benefit of

formal education, whereas general education is offered only by the school, and should not be curtailed in favor of vocational adjustment which will be achieved anyway. Achieved? How many of our people receive adequate provision for their most elemental needs, which any healthy economic system should provide? How many find work that means something to them? How many achieve decent working conditions, or know how to achieve them? How many feel that they are a part of a great coöperative endeavor to provide adequately for the needs of all? How many use their intelligence to the fullest extent in providing ever more adequately for these needs with less expenditure of human effort? How many are reasonably satisfied with that part of their life which is given over to economic endeavor? Is this desirable? It is a shame, a scandal, a disgrace to civilization. The challenge to vocational education is so immediate and so overwhelming that the plea to postpone it until children acquire their "general education" leaves one simply breathless at the revelation of the full range and scope of academic futility. Our house is burning down, and we wait to finish a chapter in our book before drawing water. This gesture may be appealing in the medieval tradition of learning, but it does not betray the slightest vestige of good sense.

Specifications of a Dynamic Program. It is true that the present provision for vocational education, which is quite recent in most schools, does not meet the larger responsibilities of vocational education as we have conceived them. For the most part it complacently accepts the *status quo*, and endeavors to adjust students to its demands. As a basis for a more dynamic vocational education we propose an extended survey of the major needs and values of our society, and of the resources, equipment, personnel, and technology available to meet them. This should reduce to a serious consideration on the part of all of the members of each new generation of what they need and want, and how they propose to get them as a society. There should be no pretence about this survey—no playing at being grown up—but it should be conducted with the perfectly definite realization and intention that these children will act on the basis of their conclusions when the time comes. It is thoroughly within their power to make whatever changes in their social arrangements they find necessary to meet their needs better. To this end the weaknesses and shortcomings of our present social arrangements should be candidly and completely examined, and promising

lines of improvement opened up for investigation. At the same time a deep and passionate loyalty to the basic conquests of our society should be cultivated. Pupils should realize the worth of these resources and defend them against irresponsible manipulation

This survey of the life-sustaining processes of our society may be called social studies or vocational education or what you will, but its relation to the work of the world is obvious. We had thought of it as an important part of general education, even in elementary education. It is thoroughly in line with the program of a great many progressive elementary schools in this country and abroad. The integrating factor in such programs is a comprehensive and continuous study of the community. We have only suggested a further integrating factor: that the central idea of this study of the community should be: How do we get the things we need and want in our society? Many educators may wish this study to be postponed until greater maturity. We doubt that this is necessary or desirable. Even first-grade youngsters are perfectly capable of appreciating the importance of a bottle of milk, and are interested and probably improved by learning something of our social arrangements for getting that bottle of milk to them. Our other basic needs are almost equally real and interesting to children. It should be remembered that if this survey is postponed until the secondary school, it can hardly be completed before many pupils have dropped out, with no chance for specific vocational preparation. In any case, wherever it exists in the elementary school, the vocational education program of the secondary school should be aware of its significance, coöperate in making this significance more apparent to children, and base the vocational education program of the secondary school upon it.

In the elementary school such a survey would be conducted from the social science point of view. In the secondary school it should be reviewed to give vocational perspective. For this reason all of the major fields of service had better be reviewed briefly, this time from the standpoint of the vocational opportunities they provide. Courses of this sort are now available in junior high schools. It is recommended that such courses or equivalent experiences be offered in every high school. Even where 95 per cent of the pupils go to college, they will profit by a consideration under guidance of probable fields of service in selecting their college, and the course of study in the senior high school which is genuinely

prerequisite to the college curriculum they will wish to follow. Even in one-teacher high schools a good textbook dealing with occupations may be secured, and its various possibilities explored with pupils.

After this review of the major fields of service, the next step is a tentative choice of one very broad field which the pupil would like to study further. It should not yet be narrowed to a specific job. Even if the pupil selects a specific job in his own mind, this choice should not be taken by the educational authorities as indicating anything more than a field of interest. How this choice may be guided is still a matter for widespread experimentation. It should probably include exploratory and try-out experiences and such counseling and guidance as the school is in a position to offer. In many fields of service the pupil will not be able to explore the activities of the expert. He could not conduct a surgical operation, for example, to discover whether his talents and interests lay in this field. In such cases the exploratory experiences should probably be directed toward the next educational steps in preparation for these fields of service, supplemented by observation of and conference with specialists. The interest and coöperation of qualified leaders of community enterprise should be solicited and utilized.

Throughout this period, prior to and concurrent with specific vocational preparation, some provision might well be made for making pupils better citizens in industry through an understanding of the present position of capital and labor in this country and abroad, the concepts of the industrial revolution, the rise of the free market, monopoly, imperialism, and the class struggle, the techniques of settlement of industrial disputes, labor legislation, and the like. While we should not want the uncritical acceptance of the concept of the class struggle any more than the uncritical acceptance of the concept of evolution, both concepts are exceedingly potent germinal ideas in modern society, and the person who is totally ignorant of either is to that extent intellectually naive, unequipped for intelligent participation in solving the problems which now confront our society. A great deal more could be said than is now the case in our public schools concerning the history and present status of labor. It would provoke opposition, but it must be repeated: teachers are not the hired hands of the employing class, even though it commonly controls boards of education. They are the servants of society as a whole; and since the great majority of their pupils enter

the ranks of labor, it is the teacher's obligation to lead pupils to understand as fairly and fully as possible the means by which their rights have been and may be protected, and by which the whole economic system may be improved to provide better for the needs of society as a whole.

In the senior high school, vocational education, as defined previously in this Issue, may properly begin. In the light of the present retention of pupils in school, it is hardly necessary to attempt differentiated education for the various major fields of service below this point. It is equally apparent, however, that such education cannot safely be postponed beyond this point. It is likely that only a small per cent of pupils will enter college for many years to come. The rest must get their formal vocational education now or never. For those who go on to college a similar provision would be highly desirable, for the chances that they will get it in college are slight. Some consideration of the field of service they will probably enter would enhance their general orientation, equip them for an intelligent choice of electives in college, and give them a goal to which they might relate their college experience.

What should be the nature of the program of vocational education in the senior high school? An admirable summary of its outstanding characteristics is included in the article, "Education for a New Society," by Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, appearing in the *Journal of the National Education Association* for January, 1935:

"The nature of an adequate program of vocational education in a democratic society makes it important that it be an integral part of the secondary period of school. Such a program of vocational education:

1. Must be treated not as an isolated problem but as an inseparable part of the unified and integrated development of the entire personality.
2. Must be preceded by intelligent counseling.
3. Must have a broad, general base as well as a sharp focus on a particular job. Thus, among other things, it must promote imagination, persistence, and initiative, which are imperative for developing new opportunities. Hundreds of new callings are in their infancy waiting to be developed.
4. Must be determined by the individual's needs and those of society and not by caprice of economic fortune.
5. Must be under public supervision and control, a basic principle established in Federal aid to education. . . .
6. Must create a picture of a better social and economic order wherein our enormous actual and potential wealth will be used for the full development of the whole people.
7. Must provide better training for work than schools formerly did,

because schools are holding boys and girls longer from entering industry. . . .

8. Must give consideration to intelligent consumption."

. To these recommendations the Committee would append the following:

1. The attention of students should continually be directed to the social function of their fields of service. They should be led to recognize that the chief consideration is: How can the needs of society in this area be served most effectively? What conditions within the industry and in our general social arrangements frustrate the complete satisfaction of this need? What steps may be taken to remedy these conditions? What techniques of social action need to be mastered in order to take these steps effectively? Such questions as these should be explored without fear or favor in both general and specialized vocational education.

2. The individualistic, competitive ideal of "success" should be questioned, and if possible eliminated. Students should learn to gauge their success in terms of getting done efficiently and thoroughly the things in which they are interested which society needs to have done. The manipulation of existing social arrangements to their own advantage, without regard to its effect upon the welfare of society, should be branded as socially, if not legally criminal. Students should come to look upon the economic piracy of the buccaneers of finance, industry, and politics as arch-treason to their society. The exploitation of labor should be regarded in the same light as torturing a cat. One of the most important outcomes of both general and vocational education should be a social conscience: a clear realization and emotional approval of the social responsibilities which a field of service entails. Entrance upon a vocation should be colored by the same spirit of consecration as ordination to the priesthood.

3. Students should be prepared for a shock when their social ideals encounter present practice. They should learn how our present society operates, to the end that their social ideals may not be dismissed as childish fancies or vented in unrealistic and ineffective nose-thumbing against the capitalistic system. They should be led to expect that ideals of social justice will finally prevail just as sanitation has prevailed over the filth of the middle ages. Meanwhile definite progress may be made in directing their field of service to social ends, provided they use or devise effective techniques of social action and do not merely lie down in the roadway

to scream and kick. The precarious status of their social ideals in present practice should not, however, be unduly exaggerated. The great majority of men in all walks of life sincerely desire to work together to provide the things they need and want.

4. The history and present status of wage earners should receive more attention than it does at present. The need for this has already been mentioned. This emphasis should be continued throughout the senior high-school program, inasmuch as the great majority of graduates will enter the ranks of labor. For them not to know, or to be deliberately misinformed by their employers, of their constitutional rights, and of effective techniques of social action by which they may settle their disputes and better their condition, would be tragedy indeed. They should know about labor unions, strikes, lock-outs, injunctions, picketing, labor legislation, and the like—realistically understanding the faults and merits of both sides, but unaffected by the timid schoolmarm's view of industrial conflict as simply too dreadful to think about. Conflict is of the essence of life. Pupils must learn not to be afraid of it, and how to meet it as free citizens in a democratic society. Future employers will also benefit through a study of the problems, the rights, and the organization of labor.

5. Thus far we have spoken of vocational elements which should be included in every program of general education. In specialized vocational education, in so far as the capacity of the learner permits, his study should include the fundamental problems of the whole field of service in which he plans to engage. It should not be restricted to the skills and background information of the specific job through which he may enter this field of service. It will emphasize the functional and dynamic character of the sort of vocational education which the Committee favors if the program is organized around the basic needs of society which the pupils intend to serve. Thus, within the general fields of business, industry, agriculture, the professions, public service, and home-making, pupils will analyze carefully what needs of society their efforts should serve, and the resources, plant, equipment, organization, personnel, and technology available for satisfying these needs. They should endeavor to get a bird's-eye view of the whole field of service from top to bottom in its social setting.

6. With this general orientation they should map out a tentative program for themselves within this field of service, and foresee as far as possible what skills, information, understandings, techniques, abilities, habits attitudes, and ideals will enable them to carry out this program. At this point the need for an adequate guidance program is clearly indicated. What remains is to acquire the personal competence which is necessary in so far as their educational opportunities in and out of school permit, and to follow developments in their chosen field of service until, at an opportune moment, they focus upon the requirements of a specific job through which they may gain entrance to their vocation.

7. Training in skills of all pupils who do not plan to enter higher institutions should be provided by the secondary school and not by other agencies in at least the amount necessary for successful entrance upon a vocation. This is the minimum, not the optimum amount of vocational training in skills which the secondary school should provide. Additional training may be provided in accordance with the following criteria:

- a. The available funds, equipment, books, teachers, etc.
 - b. The number of pupils or adults needing such training. The greatest good of the greatest number must be considered.
 - c. The absence of out-of-school provision for such training.
 - d. The social return expected from such training. The doctor may legitimately get more than the carpenter.
 - e. The general usefulness and applicability of the skills, as contrasted with those limited to one operation in a particular plant.
 - f. The general value of the skills apart from their vocational significance, as in typing.
 - g. The appropriateness of the skills to the age, interest and ability of the pupils concerned. Thus wood-working may be preferred to operating a hydraulic press.
 - h. The demand for the type of skill developed. In the past too many individuals have been trained for vocations already crowded or impossible of attainment.
8. Training in skills and information should not be allowed to overshadow, in any case, the larger responsibilities of vocational education. Training in picayune skills at the behest of particular employers which interferes with the establishment of a program of more general usefulness should

be resolutely refused. Remember that the school is responsible to society as a whole, not to the local captains of industry.

9. Even in very small schools something may be done to recognize, encourage, promote, and utilize the vocational interests of pupils. The procedures of the integrated courses which are increasing in popularity may be used to enable pupils to study a variety of fields of service within the same class. Their reports to one another of various common aspects of these fields, such as resources, organization, finance, condition of labor, local operations, and the like, may further the integrating function of secondary education. A variety and abundance of printed materials and all the resources of the local community are available for at least a generalized study of every major field of service. Although special qualifications are exceedingly desirable in directing such study, even the teacher in a one-room secondary school may do something about it. It should at least be taken into account as a central purpose to which the pupil may relate his educational experiences.

10. No program of secondary education should be regarded as acceptable unless it makes some provision for specialized vocational education and for the vocational aspects of general education previously discussed. In accrediting schools this provision should be taken into account.

11. Junior colleges should recognize the same general obligations toward vocational education as are herein proposed for the senior high school, with the additional provision that they should normally offer training for occupations of a more expert level, such as pharmacy, journalism, tool-making, and the like.

12. Whenever it is possible, secondary schools should make some provision for adult workers to extend their vocational education or to transfer to other fields of service. This will normally involve separate classes for adults, but should not curtail the opportunities of regularly enrolled pupils who have the first claim upon the facilities of the school.

13. A vast extension of the present coöperation between the school and the community will be necessary before it will be possible to offer pupils intelligently planned and supervised training in the wide variety of vocational skills which are necessary to carry on the work of our society. The school lacks the necessary equipment and trained workers, and in

many cases the stimulating air of reality which is associated with the actual conditions of employment. Many pupils who are ill-adjusted to school need contact with real work in order to develop the discipline of a responsible citizen. While pupils are given the opportunity to complete their vocational preparation under the actual conditions of employment, the secondary school should keep in touch with their progress to insure their learning what they need to learn, neither being exploited nor abusing their privileges.

14. The educational program should follow up and assist, in so far as it can, the initial adjustment of the pupil in his chosen field of service. Reference should here be made to the special agency for assisting the vocational adjustment of some pupils discussed in Issue II.

15. Secondary education should recognize the fundamental importance of vocational education as an agency for the betterment of our society, and as a magnificent instrument for reaching the social objectives of the best of the conventional school subjects. Social responsibility, scientific methods of thinking, good work habits, desirable traits of character and personality, aesthetic sensitivity, skills in reading, writing, speaking and computation, understanding of the general goals of human living and of the means by which they may be attained—all these and more may be approached as directly through vocational education as through any other segment of the curriculum. As an integrating factor, dominated by a central purpose, for bringing together the contributions of many fields of knowledge, vocational education cannot be surpassed. As an intellectual tool in making life more meaningful to the pupil it may be as effective as science or philosophy. As a medium for creative expression and joyous effort a vocation is always one's major art. As a high calling to which are summoned the full range and scope of a man's intelligence, imagination, and strength of character, providing conflict, achievement, and recognition, a vocation may be the most thrilling and meaningful goal we can set before a pupil. The full utilization of this medium of education would revolutionize secondary education and lead our society directly toward the economy of abundance.

ISSUE VI

Shall secondary education be primarily directed toward preparation for advanced studies or shall it be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses, regardless of a student's future academic career?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

Throughout most of their history the secondary schools of America have been dominated by the colleges and universities and their curriculum organized primarily with a view toward preparation for advanced studies. This was a natural development under the circumstances. In the fight for free public education in this country, pioneer educators struggled under great difficulties to establish a school system that would enjoy the respect and support of the American people. They naturally turned to the college preparatory curriculum as the most respectable body of subject-matter they could offer their pupils. These pupils on their own merits were a highly selected group of boys and girls. Both their vocational aims and their intellectual interests were, they thought, best served by academic courses having deferred values. Principle as well as expediency seemed amply to justify secondary-school educators in adopting a college preparatory curriculum in the public schools.

But the plain fact of modern times is that new conditions in society call for new types of secondary-school curricula. Tremendous changes in our social, industrial, and economic life have created the problem of adolescence—of how to occupy constructively and educate wisely all the youth of the land. Perhaps the most immediate effect of these changes has been to increase enormously secondary-school enrollments, virtually make over the character of the secondary-school population, and thrust the problem of adolescence into the lap of the schools. To meet this problem and give some sort of useful education to millions of pupils who would never go to college, the secondary school had available at first only the college preparatory curriculum with its emphasis upon deferred values, mental discipline, and formal subject-matter. Naturally it proved hopelessly inadequate. As soon as educators realized its inadequacy, many of them began seeking new materials

and methods to prevent schooling, in the case of the majority of pupils, from becoming futile.

The continuing dominance of the colleges and universities over the secondary schools in the face of this new situation in public education has brought the issue to its present serious form. Educators, however, should have no hesitation in choosing an alternative. Their experience and their knowledge indicate unmistakably that secondary education should be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses. They know perfectly well that the majority of secondary-school pupils do not go on to college, but pass directly into society. The responsibility of the school to care for such pupils and prepare them for social usefulness calls for a differentiated curriculum that will show results when these pupils end their education with the public schools. Educational psychology, in its shift of emphasis from the subject to the learner, affirms that immediate and assured values are essential to stimulating most pupils to learn. Even the schools' function to integrate socially the mass of pupils that they may all take some useful place in a coöperative social scheme demands that courses yield values significant to all. A great deal of academic material may indeed be needed, but it must produce actual results and have a direct relationship to better living. If secondary education is to be good for all pupils, the college preparatory curriculum as the only or perhaps even the main base for the school program will not do.

The selection and organization of material for a flexible secondary-school curriculum which in its various adaptations will have a maximum value for all pupils constitute a problem not yet fully solved. Important suggestions for devising a suitable curriculum are given here and in Issues IV and VII, but what should be particularly emphasized is that the solution of the problem properly belongs to the secondary school, which should solve it without an undue dependence upon higher institutions of learning. In its solution the secondary school should be primarily concerned with the values of its own courses. But it cannot expect colleges and universities to relax or alter their entrance requirements before it has developed a new curriculum having proved values. It can then invite, perhaps insist upon, the development by secondary-school and college professional organizations of college entrance requirements unencumbered by specified units and frankly recognizing that quality of personality, of mentality, and of habits of work are more fundamental factors in predicting success in

advanced studies than a collection of units in a prescribed and formal program of study.

I. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Historically, secondary education has been primarily concerned with preparation for advanced studies. A number of conditions which have accounted for this development will be briefly indicated. In the beginning of secondary education, the studies of the Latin grammar school were designed as preparation for college. Although the academy and later the high school were organized, partly in protest to the narrow curriculum of the Latin grammar school, the oldest subjects remained as requirements for entrance to college. As new subjects were added by the academy and by the high school to the secondary-school curriculum, they were accepted to a limited degree for college entrance. In time there came to be a standardized list of subjects conforming to fifteen specified units, which remains the common entrance plan of today.

Through the long period of the developing secondary school, there was general acceptance of the belief that the chief aim of education was preparation for adult life and, in particular, that secondary education was a period of preparation for advanced studies in college. This conception of the work of the school was sufficiently strong to influence definitely the organization and the instruction in the newer subjects as they were admitted to the curriculum. Although the bulk of the subject-matter consisted of mathematics and languages taught as distinct preparation for advanced work, it was believed that such material was also the most desirable preparation for those who in the early history of secondary education would not enter college halls. From this background developed the so-called classical tradition with its emphasis upon a core of language and mathematics as the most significant preparatory material for advanced work.

The Persistence of the Classical Influence. The emphasis upon preparation for advanced study was largely influenced by the learned professions. Early college life in America stressed preparation for the ministry, the law, and somewhat later medicine. It was firmly held that formalized classical knowledge was the essential material in preparation for these professions.

Candidates for professional careers were naturally concerned largely with the studies emphasized by the higher institutions. The colleges were staffed with the most scholarly products of the reigning classical culture. In turn, the college graduate became a proponent of the type of training which he had pursued and desired the same preparation for his children. Thus the hereditary social tendency and the immediate environmental urge conspired to the persistence of the classical tradition.

The urge for this type of education received additional impetus from the significant place which the college graduate has held in American life. Until the past two or three decades the low level of general culture and the lack of universal educational training gave a pronounced superiority to the college-trained individual. Whatever his limitations, as a result of the place accorded him through selectivity, the college graduate possessed something, which, to a significant extent, gave him advantageous distinction. Therefore, a natural deduction, although it would be pointed out today as fallacious, indicated the adequacy of the college curriculum and the effectiveness of the training. Large numbers of the parents of the present day secondary-school generation insist upon the same curriculum for their children as they themselves followed. They believe in the older subjects and in secondary education as preparation for advanced studies.

The Highly Selective Character of the Early High-School Enrollment. The highly selective character of the secondary school and of the college enrollment until recent times suggests also that these schools were dealing with a high degree of human suitability to the existing forms of education. The ambition, the fortitude, the capability called for by such careers as the learned professions and the corresponding emphasis of these characteristics for all others tended to weed out all those who did not persistently aspire or who were not, to some degree, especially equipped for positions of importance or who did not take kindly or satisfactorily to the material which was required. There were, no doubt, a considerable number in this latter group who dropped out by inclination rather than because of a lack of intelligence or ability.

Achievement in the prescribed subject-matter was the dominant measurement rather than any adaptation of the subject content to the capacities or interests of the pupil. Inability or unsuitability as related to preparation for ad-

vanced studies tended to invalidate continuance in any form of secondary-school work.

The Conservative Influence of the Teacher. Again, as teachers went out to staff the expanding secondary school, they carried a zealous belief in the cultural righteousness of the studies which they had pursued and they, in turn, taught as they had been taught.

For a considerable part of our national history the general lack of material wealth and the rigor of an austere and simple religious faith also added strength to a belief in the old, the known, and the established. The doctrines of mental discipline and of automatic transfer of learning everywhere prevailed. The trained conservatism of the teacher supported such stability of purpose and result. This condition operated effectively for many years against the introduction of new courses, as there were few teachers sufficiently interested or trained to offer other than well-established and traditional material. For example, the recognition of business and practical arts courses was largely hindered by the necessity of using teachers who were lacking in college preparation or in any complement of advanced training. Unfortunately, there remain vestiges of this condition and there is evidence, even now, of the question of educational prestige between the classically-trained and those who have majored in less academic material.

The Disparity Between Colleges and Secondary Schools.

As the public high school expanded to become the important educational institution of the community it tended in many respects to depart from the cloistered traditions of the preparatory school. At the same time, the college, less influenced by proximity to its support and to the everyday currents of life, remained much less affected, with the result that without practically realizing the changed demands of life, it continued to insist upon that which had once been determined as culturally desirable. Entrance requirements were increased in the quantity of specific matter and gradually in the number of definite units.

This increase influenced by both accident and design, filled up the entire time of the preparatory student and the high-school curriculum became completely or nearly an organization of subject-matter stipulated as necessary for advanced work. Whether pupils wished to enter college or not, they found it obligatory to pursue subjects designed for advanced

study. The prestige of this practice was especially onerous to the small high school.

There was some early protest against the single college preparatory curriculum; but not until the past thirty years during which secondary education has been making its major growth, has there been a significant development of an attitude hostile to the limitations of the curriculum as determined by preparation for advanced studies.

Within the last four decades the high-school curriculum has greatly broadened. Much of this has been forced by increased enrollment and the changing character of the school population. The average high school in this modern period came to have an increasingly larger proportion of pupils who planned to finish their formal education with high school than those who expected to enter college. Although this changed proportion was revolutionary, there was no commensurate change in subject-matter. College preparatory units remained dominantly the bulk of the typical school's offerings.

The college authorities for the greater part failed to recognize the educational significance of the increasing change in the high-school population and their consequent responsibility. To them the established units were now possibly even more important as a means of sifting out those who were not "college material," although by this time far more scientific methods of determining intellectual ability were being developed.

Much of the difficulty long existent and still existing relative to the issue under discussion, may be properly traced to the lack of unity between the secondary school and the college. The fact that our higher institutions originated largely as denominational or privately controlled colleges may account for much of the inarticulation between colleges and secondary schools.

The later development of the public state university has by the very nature of its support and control tended toward a certain degree of unity with the public school system. However, it has inclined to follow the traditional paths for purpose of respectability, and the possibilities for articulation with the high school have been largely ignored and confined almost solely to admission of the graduates of high schools within the state upon certificate of the completion of prescribed units, more or less traditional.

Unfortunately for purposes of unity and solidarity, the elementary, the secondary, and the higher education have had

their American origins and early development as separate institutions although the two latter were closely articulated in their earliest development. The organization and early development of the state universities were direct carry-overs from private colleges, rather than the upward growth, as a natural extension of the secondary school and resultingly the university as well as the college remains farther removed than does the high school from the insistency of the issue under discussion.

Despite the rigidity of the college requirements, the high school has in theory recognized the obligation, without knowing how the accomplishment might be achieved, to prepare the greater proportion of its graduates for immediate life situations. This latter obligation has brought clearly into focus the question of the most desirable and effective subject-matter. Any attempt to solve this problem has run diametrically athwart the college-preparatory situation. In most secondary schools it is difficult, if not impracticable, to do both, and the influence of the traditionally required subjects on new curricula has been great. It is these facts that raise clearly and emphatically the main issue of our discussion.

Social Change and the Expansion of Secondary Education.

It has taken the tremendous industrial, social, and economic changes ushered in by the twentieth century to shake seriously or question the permanent rightness of our educational heritage. These changes, vitalized by the ideal of democracy, have brought tremendous expansion of educational opportunity in America. Universal common-school education has practically been realized and universal secondary education has been largely accepted as a goal to be achieved, while higher education has received tremendous increase in enrollment. Laying aside assumptions relative to this point or the uncertainties of agreement as to the theory of universal secondary education, which has been fully discussed in Issue One, the secondary school faces the fact that it can no longer escape secondary education for all. The industrial and business opportunities formerly open to youth of fourteen to eighteen years of age are now definitely closed to them. The school or some kindred educational activity presents the one obvious solution of the great problem of what shall be done with the time and energy of adolescent youth, but with immediate pertinency the issue is raised as to the kind of school and the nature of its work. Shall it be academic and follow the tradi-

tional and the established with emphasis upon continued preparation for advanced studies or shall it respond to the intelligent and thorough-going analysis of modern youth and the conditions about him? Shall it accept the established arbitrary standards of traditional scholastic achievement or create standards of its own suitably applicable to the capacities and needs of the youth which it would be designed to serve? These are questions which cannot easily be ignored and out of the changing conditions which have created them come demands and necessities that have forced the issue between the conception of secondary education as preparation for advanced work and an education which will offer immediate and direct interpretation, not only to large numbers of pupils who will leave before graduation or who will not enter college, but to an increasing proportion who require educational experience which is immediately applicable to current life and its perplexities.

II. PREPARATION FOR ADVANCE STUDIES

A brief sketch has been given of the historical influence of the conception of secondary education as primarily concerned with preparation for advanced studies. Although changed conditions have largely affected the once predominant position of this conception there is still a very considerable body of opinion which remains favorable to this point of view. It is the prevalency of such support and the opposition which it engenders that emphasizes the importance of the issue under discussion. Recently a discussion on "Who Should Go To College?" at the annual meeting of the colleges and universities of the State of New York, to which high-school principals had been especially invited, brought out a fairly divided opposition between two main groups. At one extreme there was the belief that college preparation and college education should be formalized, academic, and restricted to a selected group of potential leaders and at the other extreme were those who would discard all such traditional criteria and adjust secondary and higher education to the capacities and needs of youth with continued education as long as there was any opportunity of reasonable benefit. This citation is offered as a fairly typical example of what will happen in any large group of school men when the issue in question is brought into the arena of discussion.

The persistence of a theory of secondary education which supports preparation for advanced studies is accounted for by more than the mere weight of tradition. There are a number of stoutly held beliefs in support of this theory which will be briefly presented.

Education as a Long-Term Investment. Theoretically, preparation for advanced studies is justified by a belief that democracy should provide education for its youth as a long-term investment. It is through educational practice conforming to this belief, it is argued, that the faith of the founders will be preserved and that proper direction and control will be given to the social group. This view holds that there are certain fundamental virtues, facts, principles, habits, and skills which society has found to be permanently right and especially significant by reason of their past effect in the development of civilization. These are the roots of our progress and justify continued cultivation whatever may be the changes in the conditions which determine nourishment.

The chief function of education is to maintain and pass on this accumulated heritage to each succeeding generation. Obviously this can best be done by those subjects which have already become a part of this inheritance and which have conclusively evidenced their power in the development of the intellectual and cultural phases of society.

The very nature of the material to be transmitted necessitates a long and continuous period of study. Its mastery is dependent upon cumulative effort and the efficiency of its usage upon suitable material. Its process is comparable to the building of a business from a zero point or the development of a farm from a pristine state over a long period of years to eventual prosperity. The goal to be achieved is the motivating force and the dominating values are those deferred until the ultimate achievement.

This philosophy stresses the importance of deferred values as those which will be especially realized through advanced studies. Immediate values not only tend to be intangible in themselves, but lack the perspective of distant goals. Such values are likely to be transitory or unrealized due to insufficient attention or lack of adequate pursuit, while the material of certain value is that which may be followed sufficiently long to crystallize accomplishment and guarantee results. Subject matter of worthy significance cannot be ex-

pected to return definite and abiding values until it has been continuously studied for a period of years.

In following this argument, there is belief that the most important values are those which are to some extent deferred. It should be recognized that not all educational values are relatively important as immediate or as deferred. Some values are obviously transitory and easily exhausted; others are peculiarly long-existent and abounding in strength; it is especially significant that the former tend to be relatively immediate and the latter are more likely to be deferred.

Consideration of immediate versus deferred values should not lose sight of the total yield. The deferred value which gives little immediate return is likely to give far greater results ultimately than the value which indicates large immediate gain but soon vanishes away. This application is particularly suitable to subjects which have proved their stability and value through the years over against those which are hastily formed out of the current urge and thinly constituted with material that may carry only passing interest and transitory significance.

Seriously it may be questioned whether secondary education may of itself set up adequate and worthy criteria for determining the relative appraisal of values. Certainly if secondary education is to be primarily concerned with its own courses, there should be convincing provision for enabling teachers and pupils to distinguish the values in new materials as superior to those which are already well established in the older courses of study. From the point of view of advanced studies as the most desirable educational preparation this provision does not now exist.

Moreover, those who are skeptical of any other conceptions would point to a condition which suggests the failure of the attempt to determine other objectives for secondary education. Certainly there seems to be much dissatisfaction with and criticism of various lists of objectives and aims which have been largely publicized. There seems to be a widely held opinion that secondary education has fallen far short of any adequate attainment of these announced aims and purposes. If these attempts have resulted in failure, then it is advanced that the objectives incident to a statement of secondary education as primarily concerned with the value of its own courses would be far more difficult not only to determine but to maintain.

Established Subjects Constitute the Best Preparation.

It is often asserted that the oldest subjects offer the most valuable courses. Supporting arguments affirm the weight of tradition, the factor of persistence, the element of difficulty, the value of mental training, the maintenance of culture. These values have been accepted as sufficient justification for the interpretation of education as preparation for adult life and they have, to large extent, influenced college preparation. As a number of these oldest subjects were continued in college, it has been considered highly important that a certain necessary and adequate foundation in the fundamentals of these subjects be obtained before the student could qualify for entrance to college. The desirability of convenient standards gave rise originally and has given continued support to the idea of a definite number of college preparatory units which were based on subject-matter to be continued in college.

The fact that in the early years of the high school but few definite organized courses existed; that these were offered under a tremendous spread of varying circumstances; that there were few well-trained teachers; that there were no adequate measures of the quality of preparatory work—all called for the creation of helpful standards. The establishment of unit requirements and eventually the college entrance examination brought an uplift to the quality of secondary school work which has long received noteworthy consideration. It is this consideration which still points out the inadequacies and the weaknesses of secondary-school material which has not been refined and standardized by the principles which have been used to organize and establish the traditional college preparatory units.

Certainly in its early development the secondary school had little to offer in the matter of standards except that which had been inspired by the influence of higher education. This fact has laid the basis for the development of the so-called domination of the secondary school by the higher institutions and the continuance of the belief in the preparation for advanced studies.

The justifiable eagerness of the colleges to reach further heights in the realm of knowledge and scholarly achievement tended to a constant effort not only to demand more from the aspiring entrant but to push the more elementary phases of subject matter down into the preparatory years. This insistence, it may be said, was welcomed by ambitious secondary

schools. The high-school college preparatory curriculum of recent times is largely the advanced college curriculum of the earliest colleges. This tendency to add more material to high-school courses was particularly influential in emphasizing the principle of continuity in those subjects which were most strongly established as illustrated by the languages and mathematics. These subjects were gradually developed by the colleges into detailed advanced courses for which more specific preparatory background and skill were increasingly necessary. It is this historic development of the oldest subjects which has given them not only a dominant place in the curriculum but also a supporting philosophy which maintains to-day the continuation of the theory and practice in secondary schools of preparation for advanced studies.

The Subjects of Most Value. The theory that secondary education should be primarily concerned with preparation for advanced studies has also been influenced by the belief that the traditional subjects are of most value educationally, regardless of preparation for advanced studies. This belief established the practice that certain subjects are sufficiently important to require pursuit regardless of the ability or the purpose of the student. Such long accepted theory and its attendant practice have obviously definitely influenced the character of secondary education in this country. A not inconsiderable body of influential people support these tenets to-day. The strongest adherents are found particularly among the older generation who were products of such schooling. Among those who support this conception of education are those who believe that the tendency to evaluate all subject matter on a basis of equality merely confuses the issue, muddles the true conception of educational values, and leads to an assumption of the equality of opportunity which does not exist. There is also a rather large group of teachers who publicly vouchsafe the newer educational philosophy, but who among intimates express themselves as skeptics of subject-matter which no longer has the fundamental virtues of the once reigning college-preparatory culture.

These virtues, if an attempt is made to reduce varying expressions of them to a specific statement, may be summed up as mental training which is obtained through achievement over difficulty. As a usual supplement there is persistent belief that certain subjects train the mind and that they do this largely through the difficulties presented by abstract theories,

memorized responses, and demonstrations of accuracy as determined by rules and formulas. This belief is especially strong in the lay field and it is also largely supported by the faculties of the universities and colleges other than those affiliated with departments or schools of education. It is this situation which emphasizes the importance of the issue as stated. Such modern educational conceptions as: interest as the dominant motivation; modification of subject-matter to individual need and ability; the selection of courses on the basis of current application in place of those which more assuredly offer sufficient abstraction and formal organization as to challenge achievement through difficulty, are examples of some of the items which cause differences in belief and raise important questions created by the issue under discussion.

The Functional Power of Preparation for Advanced Studies. There has been the belief, also, that the older and more formal subject matter was functional and that it was definitely desirable for practical purposes as well as cultural. Preparation for advanced work implies also the cultivation of functional power. Secondary schools will be expected to be responsible for developing power in the individual pupil even with their own ends in view. Power in respect to effort, in thought and in application must be recognized and gained through achievement over difficulty. It has been a major contention of the college that the more difficult subjects are the best means not only of developing power but of insuring productive habits of work and indicating sufficient mental ability for success in college.

The college is often charged with inarticulation of work and purpose with the secondary school because it repeats certain fundamental courses of secondary-school grade in its freshman year, but colleges reply that such repetition is necessary because the work of the secondary school fails to function. The college students who find it desirable to repeat secondary-school courses are lacking in the power which comes from adequate preparation for advanced studies. Certain academic subjects have long held strategic positions in the curriculum as exemplification of this type of training and the transfer of such ability has been supported as a general outcome. The significance of this conception of educational philosophy has been well stated time and again.¹

¹The *Classical Investigation*. Part I. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1924.

The selective nature of the narrow classical curriculum undoubtedly resulted in graduates who functioned successfully in positions of importance and leadership. This furthered an inference favorable to academic culture and created a prestige eagerly sought as socially desirable and significant. Faith in this particular point of view remains prevalent especially among those not engaged in the specific field of professional education.

College Requirements Maintain the Desirability of Preparation for Advanced Studies. The subjects most representative of this traditional conception are formal mathematics, formal science, formal grammar, and the ancient and modern languages. Until quite recently, colleges insisted upon preparation involving approximately twelve units of fourteen and a half or fifteen from those listed above.² Eastern colleges of to-day generally require from eight to ten of these units and some are still holding to eleven or twelve. Many western colleges have reduced requirements in these traditional subjects to five or six units.

Although specific requirements have tended to be reduced, the lessening is more apparent than real, as the electives are often confined to a restricted list. This list is largely made up of subjects removed from the required list and selection from it is influenced by the continuance of subject-matter already studied as preparatory requirements. The extension of the acceptance of new subjects is relatively small.

There are a few colleges which have openly stated that they are no longer interested in unit prescriptions as requirements. This position marks a complete break in the conception of the secondary school as a preparation for certain advanced studies.

A considerable number of colleges have recently abrogated specific subject requirements for students of exceptional scholastic record, but curiously enough, it is these students who seldom wish to depart from the traditional preparation. It is rather the student of mediocre or worse scholarship record who evidences independent and exploratory desires, but it is this type of student who is definitely required to manifest his ability in the old and standardized college preparatory units. The colleges maintain that the mediocre or poor student is best prepared to do college work by the experience of

²P. R. Brammell: *Articulation of High School and College*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 10, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

meeting the standardized college requirements. The brilliant student may overcome the handicap of missing this experience by his superior ability to adjust himself to new academic situations but the mediocre student must have a deeper grounding in the established fundamentals.

The theory of education as preparation for advanced studies is maintained through a continued belief in the traditional subjects as those of most value. It is probably no over-statement to affirm that both the weight of lay and of college professorial opinion remains favorable to this point of view. Studies of the programs offered in high-school curriculums would corroborate the persisting influence of the older subjects.³

The Secondary School As A Selective Institution. From its inception to the present day the high school has operated as a selective institution. As late as 1922 this was amply demonstrated in the studies made by George S. Counts.⁴ In this study intelligence was found to be a prime factor in the persistence in high school and social and economic status were particularly important.

The last decade has seen some changes in the situation. Surveys made of thousands of high-school seniors in several states indicate that intelligence is not the most operative element of selection and persistence. Social, economic, and environmental influences remain major elements in selection and persistence, but are diminishing in their degree of influence.⁵

Those who doubt that secondary education should be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses argue that the high school ought to be selective, that only those who possess the mental ability to master the established academic material should receive a complete high-school education. The argument continues that all others are incompetent for higher education and are chiefly motivated by the desire for privilege, for prestige, for the career opportunities which inevitably are limited to the able few. Such motivation, it is maintained, results in large educational waste and in ultimate disillusionment.

³I. V. Koos: *The American Secondary School*, Chaps. XI, XII. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1927.

⁴G. S. Counts: *The Senior High-School Curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926. See also by the same author: *Program of Studies*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 19, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17. *The Selective Character of American Secondary Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932.

⁵W. F. Book: *The Intelligence of High-School Seniors*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1922.

A. H. Turney: *Factors Other Than Intelligence That Affect Success in High School*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1930.

The view of secondary education stated above has a European background which is based on an educational system which will select and train only those who are best qualified to become the political, social, and economic leaders. Those who support this educational outlook contend that secondary education designed for general consumption as determined by its own values rather than the selection of those who are certain of profit will result in a lowering of standards, in a satisfaction with mere mediocrity, and a general leveling down of intellectual achievement.

Although the necessary brevity of this presentation limits the fullest development of the thesis of secondary education as preparation for advanced studies, it has obviously indicated the powerful position which this theory has maintained in our educational situation. In strategic place through historical development; supported by the persistence of a classical heritage, and the conservative influence of the teaching profession; maintained by a philosophy which believes in education as preparation for adult life, and in the old and well established subjects as those of most value; and aided by the lack of unity in organization and purpose among the various units and divisions of the entire educational system, the conception of secondary education as preparation for advanced studies is clearly and definitely in opposition to the alternative proposed.

III. SECONDARY EDUCATION AS PRIMARILY CONCERNED WITH ITS OWN COURSES

At several points in the preceding discussion it has been indicated that changes in modern society have brought into the consideration of secondary education new problems of great importance. Many of the significant changes have been recorded and discussed in *Recent Social Trends in the United States*⁶ and in "The Changing World and the Curriculum" in Briggs' *Secondary Education*.⁷ The twentieth century has brought a new world of human relations. Certainly society has become more complicated. The forms of social and political control, the relations of groups one to another, the place of the individual, all are potent in determining what secondary education should be. Education as a whole and secondary education in particular have come into a new, vital, and much more intimate relation to the major problems and difficulties

⁶New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1933.

⁷New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933.

of the human race in these later years. These are facts which are readily discernible argues the modern progressively minded educator with the deduction that the time honored beliefs in educational theory and practice are outworn and inadequate. If these new conditions and immediate needs are properly met, the school cannot justify time for the extended pursuit of out-moded subject-matter. It is maintained that the individual of the present day, if he is to be suitably oriented to the conditions which he must face and if he is to make satisfactory use of whatever opportunities there may be for him, will accomplish it largely through an education which is concerned with immediate values, with courses of study and educational activities which are determined not by traditions or outlived formalized knowledge, but by the pressing problems which face youth to-day. From this thesis develops the corollary that secondary-education courses determined and presented for their own values would result not only in significant articulation with life itself but would in the end give a much more effective preparation for whatever studies might come later than subjects which have generally been used for such preparation.

Equal Educational Opportunity Emphasizes Secondary Education for the Value of its Own Courses. The theory of the equality of opportunity has, in the main, been interpreted as equality of educational opportunity. This conception has reacted into increases in the limits of the compulsory school attendance laws; and it accounts, in large measure, for increased belief and support in universal education. The increasing participation of the state and of the Federal government in the education of youth with special regard to the support given to sections weak in financial resources, offers additional and powerful evidence of the strengthening of this position. The development of the democratic spirit which influences the desire for educational equality has reacted strongly against so-called aristocratic practices or selective factors. The proponents of a greater democracy have supported the idea of the high school as the "people's college" and argued secondary education for "all the children of all the people." Such extension of educational opportunity, it is maintained, would result in pulling up the level of the mass rather than to level down or to increase mediocrity. Leaders in this philosophy have stated that the extension of education would increase both the opportunities for leadership and the quality of the "followership." Economic expediency, too, has undoubtedly

played an important part in popularizing secondary education. The public has largely accepted the extension of education as furthering equal economic opportunity. It is generally believed that a high-school education is a necessary preparation for getting a better job. That America has been dominantly interested in the extension of secondary education, whatever may be the combination of reasons, is abundantly demonstrated by the universal growth of the high school in recent times.

The emphasis upon equality of opportunity has brought into sharp contrast the needs and capabilities of pupils as against the types of educational courses offered them. As a significant movement in the expansion of the democratic urge in America, the increased recognition of the importance of the individual has brought enlarged support to a belief in equality of opportunity as the means of development for the individual. Individualized opportunity has necessitated new relationships of the student to the material studies. It is contended that differentiated pupil ability calls for variation in subject-matter, that practical realization of available opportunities is determined by values within the courses pursued. It is also pointed out that distant and oftentimes unrealizable goals may and probably will result in serious economic and spiritual loss to both the student and to society. Attempts to interpret the principle of equal opportunity have resulted in necessary adaptation of formalized programs with increasing development of courses originated from the current secondary-school situation. The further extension of these attempts would seem to indicate larger emphasis of the high schools own courses and continued diminution of preparation for advanced studies.

Increased Social Needs Create New Demands Upon Secondary Education. Some of the reasons for the unique and extraordinary development of secondary education in America⁸ have already been indicated. The dominant belief of the day supports secondary education as education for adolescence, to the same universal degree as elementary education is supported for childhood.⁹ It has already been indicated that current educational philosophy supports such belief as the basic right of the individual; but there is another and increasingly powerful argument which is furthered by the wide interest in social welfare.

⁸C. H. Judd: *The Unique Character of Secondary Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

⁹See Issue I.

It is held that elementary education is not sufficient to fit the individual with the information and skill necessary to a minimum participation in the complex society of the day. Moreover, the social complexity increases at a faster acceleration than do educational means of preparing individuals to cope with it.¹⁰ The assumption follows that this lag is largely true because the school curriculum has been too much concerned with the inheritances from the past and, as opponents would say, the fallacious interpretation that drill in formalized material would develop a background against which immediate life situations could be successfully thrown. That a lag exists is offered in itself as sufficient evidence of the failure of traditional subject-matter as desirable preparation for life.

It is now well established that business and industry increasingly expect those who enter their various activities to be equipped with a secondary-school education. Elementary education will no longer suffice except in the activities which are peculiarly unskilled. For immediately successful adjustment to the demands of business and industry emphasis has been placed upon courses which carry values in specific training as well as general preparation. The school has found it increasingly necessary to create and refine courses which will prepare many of its students for direct entrance to employment fields. As such courses have not been generally evaluated by higher institutions, it has been necessary for the secondary school to determine and apply such values as seemed to be in accordance with the needs of its own situation. By reason of the vitality and significance involved proponents of these courses believe that the content contains larger educational values for all students than the pursuit of restricted material in preparation for advanced studies would have for a few.

It is further contended that the "real business of living" has constantly grown more complex in all of its many elements and that all of this unites in larger demands upon the individual which can only be met satisfactorily by increased use and adaptation of educational facilities. In general the desirable educational activity necessary to provide the individual with the minimum equipment to meet the extended requirements of society are allocated to the secondary-school field. This argument for universal secondary education is supported by definite provision, that the character and composi-

¹⁰President's Research Committee on Social Trends: *Recent Social Trends in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1933.

tion of the students of secondary-school age and the problems and conditions which these students face in contemporary life must together, form the basic elements upon which courses of study are built. Obviously under such interpretation preparation for advanced studies will not be of major consideration.

The Increasingly Different Character of the Secondary-School Population Emphasizes the Need for a Reorganized Curriculum. The growth in numbers and the change in the character of the high-school population are other factors offered in support of the second alternative of the issue. It is argued that the large increase in enrollment and the change in the type of pupil have tended to nullify the hitherto discriminating factors of selection, with the result that there has been a greatly increased spread in the abilities and interests of those enrolled. When the school operated solely on the narrow program of preparation for advanced studies those who failed to respond to the limited fare and restricted opportunities were quickly eliminated. Now secondary education is faced with the gigantic problem of providing for all who enter and persist in the school, and failure to provide offerings suited to the capacities of those who do not respond to traditional subject-matter means large educational waste and futility, mere attendance under a kind of duress, or a wholesale ejection into the streets and alleys.¹¹

Pupils in the high school may be broadly classed into several groupings: "those who are reasonably certain to continue until they enter college; those who will drop out at the end of one or two semesters; those whose stay in school is indeterminate." Among these is also a group which has a definite vocational bent—for example, the trade and business pupils; and a group, rapidly increasing the last few years, of those who intend to finish high school but for no declared or definite purpose.

It is generally admitted that the school should continue to meet the college needs of the first group, although the point is advanced that a thorough analysis of the implications precipitated by the main issue under discussion would find much support for the urgency of extended change in the character of the subject-matter offered for college entrance. Persons favorable to this interpretation also point out that the urgency

¹¹G. N. Kefauver, V. H. Noll, and C. E. Drake: *The Secondary-School Population*, National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 4. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

of curriculum adjustment is equally desirable and necessary, regardless of a specified intent for advanced study. This is held to be especially important in relation to the pupils who will drop out before graduation or who may stay, persisting for varying lengths of time with undeterminate purpose. This view is reinforced by submission of the fact that, even of the graduates in the typical high school, fewer than half actually enter college. The secondary school is held to have an obligation to educate all youth if it is to contribute to the betterment of society.

Further consideration raises the question of what material is most valuable to those pupils who may leave for various reasons at the end of the second year, and so on. The heavy mortality, especially following the first and second years of high school which results in approximately two-thirds of all high-school pupils being found in the first two years, indicates that the subject matter which is most essential for functioning purposes should come in the early years of the secondary-school curriculum. If the needs of society and the adolescent are to be met, every year of training must be intrinsically valuable. Those who support the impartial analysis of values maintain that an uncertain smattering of abstract material or of a foreign language cannot easily be substantiated as the most valuable or effective subject-matter. Many would hold with Briggs that "admission of such futility does not assume hostility to a reasonable mastery of these subjects," although these same persons in supporting a theory or practice which prepares students ineffectively for advanced studies which, by reason of inability, disinclination, or inaptitude, they will never pursue, would argue for the discredited disciplinary value of the difficulties involved. As well argue for the nutritive value of food that cannot be swallowed or digested.

The preceding discussion has been offered in support of the implication that there must be a large variance of curriculum materials and of activities to meet the differing abilities, interests, and purposes of high-school pupils as these have increased and changed in the modern secondary school. Also, that there should be an increasing attempt to provide for the diversity in career, vocational, special talent, and specific purpose interests and needs of adolescents. A suitable realization of the implications suggested would seem to depend largely upon the values developed by new courses organized directly by the secondary school.

The New Philosophy of Education Justifies Immediate Values. John Dewey's statements of the essential purposes of education are widely accepted and followed.¹² His philosophy defining the goal of all educative endeavor in social terms has profoundly affected elementary school practice, permeated the influences which inspired and organized the junior high school and has increasingly disturbed the secondary school. In interpreting the Dewey influence, Kandel writes, "Everything that makes a man a man is to be found not in a few favored subjects, but in all those interests and activities that are of social significance."¹³

The findings of modern psychology have made significant contribution to the philosophy of secondary education in respect to adolescent development and to the recognition and treatment of the individual personality. Formerly, the subject and not the child has been the important consideration in both the administration and the instruction of the typical high school. Today those interested in the so-called new philosophy of education would emphasize that there is large and increasing emphasis upon the individual pupil as the consideration of primary importance. The school, it is increasingly assumed, must fit its subject matter and its instructional processes to the pupil. Under such interpretations it is held that preparation for the traditionally prescribed advanced studies diminishes to a minor obligation.

Gradually the belief has been developed that secondary education must offer curriculum material and pupil activities adequately designed to meet the divergent needs, the varying abilities, and the special aptitudes of all adolescent youth, apart from the consideration of continuance in advanced studies. This conviction is attested to by such statements as the following: "If the promise of American democracy is to be completely or satisfactorily fulfilled, there is reason to believe that it must come through the secondary school—the school in which the masses will receive the final years of their formal education."¹⁴

Those who believe that the recognition of immediate values in secondary education is a definite need; that there is little justification in formalized courses with remote objectives, maintain that pupil attitudes may easily be adversely affected through long continued preparation without discern-

¹²John Dewey: *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916.

¹³L. Kandel: *History of Secondary Education*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1930.

¹⁴J. C. Chapman and G. S. Counts: *Principles of Education*, p. 476. New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1924.

ible and helpful application to immediate outcomes. Lack of opportunity to apply the material studied or to understand and interpret it in the light of current problems may result in an attitude of futility or disillusionment. The criticism is often made that students are out of touch with the world of reality and accordingly must face the inevitable difficulty of adjustment when formal education is finished. Those who support the doctrine of immediate values accept the need for preconceived goals. They realize that progress and attainment must be directed toward desirable outcomes. The goals, however, may be in many instances immediate rather than deferred, and the latter when justified should be largely a matter of progressive extension from the immediate as the pupil advances in his educational experience. The most important consideration is that the pupil must set for himself a goal and that he be an active participant in understanding and determining the goals for the group. Such experience of necessity emphasizes the immediate, although it may indicate a path to the future.

The suggestion is often heard that pupils are not interested in school because the goals offered are too distant. Many pupils need the mental stimulation of immediate outcomes. Failure in many instances is attributed to the lack of vital appeal which is emphasized through immediate values. It is reported that many children leave school because they desire greater reality than is presented by deferred values. The contention is made that obviously there is ample need that courses designed for immediate consumption should be placed within the high-school curriculum.

The Need for Functional Material and Activity. It is rather generally held that the secondary school should complete the base which the elementary school has largely built in the mastery of the most fundamental processes; also that it should accept responsibility for passing on the essential knowledge and activity of the social inheritance. Although such material may be largely academic in character, it is pointed out that it should be selected primarily for function and made properly proportionate to the sum total of the activities which are desirable for the education of adolescent youth. It is probably not desirable that all thought or connection with advanced studies shall be disregarded but rather that whatever use is made of them shall function in the present. The functional argument is also enforced by the em-

phasis of modern psychology upon the opportunity for economy of time and efficiency in utilizing a learning process which teaches tool skills by their use.

Further support of a curriculum based upon assured and proximate values emphasizes the point that function will be dependent upon the recognition accorded to differences in individual capacity. The increasing heterogeneity of the high-school enrollment, and the philosophy, too, which sees the need for recognition of special talents, particular interests, for guiding the pupil to a reasonably arrived at choice of career, increases the necessity for differentiation. In order to make certain that courses of study are truly functional, there must be adjustments in methods, in qualitative and quantitative requirements, and in classification, all of which will change considerably any theory or practice conceived solely on the premise of secondary education as preparation for advanced studies.

Correlative with the need for differentiation is the argument for integration. That the many divers and conflicting elements in our society of to-day may be adequately understood and properly balanced with a reasonable hope of resulting solidarity of essential elements, there must be suitable recognition of the place and function of the important factors of integration. It is recognized that certain knowledge and ideals are desirable for an essential common unity in democratic society. The efficient functioning of society is, moreover, dependent upon certain common interests, commonly understood and appreciated. The secondary school, in accordance with this conception, must carry forward whatever is necessary in the way of developing immediately functional values within subject-matter and within activity that it may educate an integrated individual able to participate effectively in the social scheme.

There is some agreement that much of the material which may be used as functional will probably be of an academic character. If such material can be directed to suitable ends, without displacing other types of activity or material which are more appropriate for functional use, the older subject-matter will serve to meet the need and render a far greater measure of service than when offered under former aims. However worthy the subject-matter may be, there is enthusiastic argument that it must be used and interpreted in the secondary schools for the making of better living to-day.

The Reorganized Secondary School Emphasizes the Value of its Own Courses. The definition of secondary education as used by this commission assumes an educational activity that covers the entire period of general education from the elementary school to the upper division of the liberal arts college. Within this scope falls the junior high school at one extreme and the junior college at the other. The extensive development of both of these divisions of secondary education¹⁵ may be offered as direct evidence of a very considerable attempt to adapt the modern school to the needs of its pupils. This has been especially true of the junior high school with resulting diminution of the practice of preparing the pupils of the eighth grade for a type of learning which would be continued in the ninth grade and beyond as preparation for advanced studies.

The inclusion of the ninth grade in the junior high-school organization has brought about a wide effort to remove the first year of the secondary school from the influence and practice of college preparation. As a result, some accrediting agencies have eliminated the ninth grade from the college entrance requirement of fifteen units thus leaving the assumption that twelve required units would be gained in the last three years of the secondary school. The continued insistence of many of the colleges, however, upon four years of English with but three units of credit therefor has forced the ninth grade English to still be considered as college preparatory. The pupil who wishes to prepare for engineering also finds it necessary to start his college preparatory mathematics in the ninth grade. The emphasis upon languages by many colleges also makes it desirable for a considerable number of pupils to do college preparatory language in the ninth grade. Moreover, if the pupil wishes to pursue in his last three years of secondary school any courses which may not receive full recognition from the college he finds that ninth grade courses of specific college preparatory character are essential even under the twelve unit plan.

From practice of this kind it is apparent that the issue between preparation for advanced studies and primary concern within its own courses has not been solved by the development of the junior high school. However, the many available studies and reports of the progress of the junior

¹⁵F. T. Spaulding, O. I. Frederick, and L. V. Koos: *The Reorganization of Secondary Education*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 5. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

high school as given, for example, in Monograph No. 5 previously referred to, demonstrate conclusively that the weight of the current theory and the present tendency in practice are toward the fuller realization of secondary-education courses for their own values.

The junior college does not generally show as striking evidence of reorganization in curriculum materials and educational activity as may be found in the junior high school.¹⁶ But the development of the junior college is more recent and less certain in its objectives.

It appears reasonably evident that the junior college has made sufficient progress to create a place for itself as an integral part of the public school system. As such a part, it gives promise of developing a condition which offers large escape from the established college entrance complexities.

Although at first the junior college seemed largely directed as a transfer medium from high school to the liberal arts college, its later tendency has been more toward the purpose of continuing secondary education until such time as the general educational needs of youth are met, particularly for those who do not find it advisable to continue in college until graduation from a liberal arts course. There seems to be general agreement that this is the chief function of the junior college; and that otherwise there is small justification for its development. The North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges has authorized a number of experiments designed to further the attempt of the junior college to find for itself a place other than that of a mere link in the continuity of preparation for advanced studies. The Chicago junior colleges have recently been reorganized with the intent to develop values within their own courses. The philosophy which supports the junior college emphasizes the conception of secondary education as primarily concerned with its own courses.¹⁷

The junior college has found the same difficulties in the transfer of its students to the upper years of colleges and universities as the secondary school has found in the preparation of its pupils for entrance to the freshman year. The senior college expects students to meet certain formal requirements which are determined by the conception of education as preparation for advanced studies. Such demands,

¹⁶W. C. Eells: *The Junior College*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1931.

¹⁷G. N. Kefauver and C. Bullard: *The Organization of the Junior College as an Agency for Democracy*, pp. 82-191. Department of Secondary-School Principals of the National Education Association, Bulletin No. 35 (March, 1931).

obviously, interfere with the true function of the junior college. An effective statement of the restricting influence of the senior college has been made by the former president of the Bradford Junior College, who became later the president and organizer of the Sarah Lawrence Junior College.¹⁸

Studies within the junior-college field have discovered the same evidence found earlier by investigations which studied the success of high-school students in college.¹⁹ These studies reflect serious doubt upon the validity of prerequisites as they have been used. Successful advanced work by students who have transferred from junior colleges is indicated to better advantage by the quality of their work rather than by the specific courses taken.

IV. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS IMPLIED BY THE ISSUE

1. May the college legitimately demand preparation for advance studies to the exclusion of the more assumed and proximate needs of secondary-school pupils?

The insistence of the college upon certain specific subject matter is predicated upon the belief that such material trains the mind as no other material can do, prepares for further study in the same fields, and is a necessary part of the education of every educated person. Psychologically, the degree of general mental training afforded by specific subjects is quite uncertain at best. The favorable argument does not sufficiently warrant the requirement of certain subjects upon a premise of mental training. Researches conclude that if students possess certain native endowment and character traits the preparatory subject-matter makes no appreciable difference in college success.²⁰ Similar studies add to the supporting evidence. There is a marked trend among colleges to insist less upon specific subject-matter and more upon character traits and demonstrated intelligence.

It is reasonable to assume that preparation in a given field is advantageous for continuance in that same field in college, yet in this respect there seems to be a marked inconsistency on the part of the college. Few colleges now insist upon a continuance of all or even of a majority of the

¹⁸M. C. Graves: "After the Junior College—What?" *Junior College Journal*, 4:111-115. (December, 1933).

¹⁹Palmer Johnson: "Evaluation of the Courses in Elementary Botany as a Preparation for Sequent Courses," *Science Education*, 15:201-15 (May, 1931).

²⁰L. Bolenbaugh and W. M. Proctor: "Relation of Subjects Taken in High School to Success in College," *Journal of Educational Research*, XV:2 (February, 1927).

subjects which they demand for entrance. Many require two or three units of preparatory mathematics of a specific nature, but excuse the student from further pursuit of the subject in college. Many demand from three to five units in two different fields of foreign language, but, at most, require the further study of only one and often this may be an entirely different language for which a beginning class will be set up in college. Oddly enough, few college courses require in their assignments use of the foreign languages that are accredited.

Such disregard of preparation for advanced studies leads to the deduction that if the college no longer can hold to the theory of mental training, it does use certain subjects merely as definite hurdles of difficulty, whereas it would seem obviously far more reasonable to insist upon a larger degree of college continuance and use in the fields required as preparatory. Schools of engineering stand out as consistent examples of the latter requirement. Mathematics is emphasized as preparation in the secondary school and mathematics is definitely a continued requirement in engineering colleges.

The contention that certain specific college preparatory subjects are a necessary part of the training of every educated person can be justified if such subjects may be assumed to meet the needs of all adolescents for social adjustment, differentiation, integration, vocational direction, capacity discoveries, personal development, and culture. No such assumption can be substantiated.

The criticism is prevalent to-day that these subjects have failed in the past to meet such tests as is evidenced by the inability of those who have studied them to adjust promptly and satisfactorily to changing conditions, "to find themselves," and to use other cultural materials, especially the new. At best it has always been a relatively small group who have been able to profit personally and socially by restricted subject-matter. A reasonable assumption is that the small number of students so equipped and so inclined for such profit may still be accorded opportunities peculiarly designed for them and fortunately not to the detriment or hindrance of a much larger group who are responsive only to differing types of material. The fact that many colleges now forego the stipulation of exact subject requirement for those pupils who offer a superior high-school record is significant in this connection.

2. May certain subjects have a place in secondary education, regardless of their relation to preparation for advanced

studies, by reason of values which may be expected to accrue after extended study?

The evidence seems lacking in support of a thesis which proclaims that certain subjects, for example, mathematics and foreign languages, must receive long continued study before any definite values may be realized. It is generally recognized, of course, that extended study is necessary if mastery is the aim. If ability to use foreign language, for example, as a tool, is the desired end, then long extended practice will ordinarily be necessary. It is believed, however, that there are certain values within these fields which may be obtained without extensive pursuit. If so, the secondary school should be urged to consider the possible values accruing from aims other than mastery of the subject for skill purposes and to experiment specifically with materials in these fields by suitable reorganization of content and methods that each unit of work may be made proportionately valuable to the time pursued.²¹ Such consideration, pursued at length, might affect, for instance, the common high-school practice and the college requirement of the completion of two units of a single language before the granting of any credit; also, the extensive emphasis for pupils to follow through the traditional requirements in algebra and geometry.

The weight of opinion, if not of experiment, indicates that often times courses, such as those named above, are relatively narrow in application, formal in presentation, and limited in appeal or suitability to the students who are required or permitted to take them. Both the rate of failure and the degree of mortality in these subjects testify to such limitations. Therefore, it appears logical that the high school should require, as prerequisites for enrollment in such courses, certain positive evidence of pupil ability and interest sufficiently adequate to indicate success. Prior to final decision as to pupil entrance into courses of such character it would seem advisable to provide opportunities for exploration so organized as to be of maximum direct value. These try-out courses, within current limitations, should be so designed as to reveal to pupils the nature of the study required for mastery of the course, the immediate outcomes, the values to be eventually realized, and the aptitudes necessary for success. Under these provisions, adequately developed and adminis-

²¹See by way of illustration: *The Classroom Teacher*, Vol. X. "The Junior High School," by Thomas H. Briggs, pp. 47-59. Chicago: Classroom Teacher, Inc., 1927.

tered, it is highly probable that such subjects may be justifiably allocated within the secondary school.

3. Do the interests and needs of a considerable group of pupils justify a curriculum planned solely for them in terms of preparation for advanced studies and should these pupils be in any way distinguished and separated from other students?

It is largely held that the grouping of pupils on the basis of common interests and equivalent intellectual maturity and achievement may promote effective instruction. There seems little support of a plan based on the need of preparation for advanced study as a primary factor in determining such grouping. It therefore seems a fair assumption that when grouping of pupils according to interests, maturity, and achievement promises to further their intellectual progress, such grouping should be made without specific reference to preparation for advanced study.

The fact remains that colleges do impose specific subject-matter requirements upon certain pupils. In view of the implications presented in the discussion of the conception of secondary education as primarily concerned with the values of its own courses it would appear reasonable that the college-imposed subjects should not be substituted for material which is generally considered as more suitable for adolescents. A more tenable arrangement would make the college preparatory requirement additional to the normal secondary-school work permissive only to those who wished and were able to meet such additional requirements. This would mean a complete reversal of present-day procedure. It would necessarily involve, as well, a considerable curtailment of required college preparatory subjects and a larger recognition of the values of other and newer subjects as suitable for college entrance.

If the college requirements that seem unjustifiable for all students cannot be offered except as additional subjects for unusually able students, it may prove advisable to segregate pupils who are preparing for college in order that material suitable to those not preparing for college may escape limitation and formality in their education. It is also important that college-preparatory pupils may be directed to the specific purpose involved without interference from others which may handicap successful college preparation. Segregation for such purposes is more readily specific in its intent and may be more easily justified theoretically when it takes place in the upper year. When the twelfth grade is reached, for

example, essential fundamental values have been largely established. By this stage, persistence, background, and maturity have brought abilities and inclinations into realization. Possible goals and specialized preparation present opportunities for understanding and appreciation. Specific college-preparatory goals could be applied at this time with an efficiency which would probably save much educational waste incident to the present plan of the continuance of the college objective over a long preparatory period. However, it should be strongly affirmed that college-preparatory pupils need not be segregated in all of their work, but only in that which especially demands differentiation.

This phase of the discussion may be summed up with a conclusion which supports a secondary-school curriculum that is primarily designed for the immediate and assured needs of the pupils. It may be further stated that pupils seeking preparation for college should be required, on the ground of the schools' responsibility for an adequate return to the supporting social group, to prove their right to a specific preparation for college by the submission of suitable evidence of ability and promise. If the pupils in question are insistent on preparation for particular colleges, evidence should be presented as to suitability to the type of education offered by the colleges selected. It should always be remembered that the public who pays for education has a right to be assured that what is furnished is worth the cost.

4. May the primary concern of the school with preparation for advanced studies be justified by reason of the extreme difficulty in determining who should not do advanced work?

It is readily discerned that some students are not competent for advanced work and sooner or later it may be said that such students have reached the saturation point in respect to specific preparation for advanced studies, although this does not necessarily imply that such a point may have been reached in respect to other educational activity. It is exceedingly difficult to find out definitely who these students are, at least, in the early years of the secondary school. Therefore, it may be assumed that opportunity should be given for students to prepare for advanced work until such time as the evidence of incompetence in such material is past all reasonable doubt. As evidence of this character is often not conclusive until the later years of the secondary school, the conclusion is that the high school must concern itself with the preparation for advanced work, making it maximally valuable in itself.

Some qualifying considerations upon such a conclusion should be pointed out. There is the problem created in respect to the gradual lengthening of the span between preparation and fruition. Modern society is definitely extending the period of infancy and the years of educational preparation. This extension tends to increase, also, the difficulty incident to the presentation of material with deferred values. Pedagogically, the span of the pupil's interest must likewise be extended and pupil interest is not ordinarily increased by moving the outcomes further in the distance. It seems reasonably clear that the principle of immediate values applies with greater ease and certainty to the junior high-school years; while in the upper high-school grades, as pupils settle upon definite careers, there is more justification for a theory of preparation for advanced work.

It should also be indicated that the chief difficulty in determining who should do advanced work has been largely due to the past inadequacy of our marking systems and rating devices. The testing movement has now grown to such proportions and the methods of application to such accuracy, that there is no longer much excuse for sole reliance upon the hazards and wastage of the old belief, that all should have the same material that we may discover who should go on with advanced work.

Such agencies as the Coöperative Test Service and the State Bureaus of Testing have made it possible for schools and colleges to make use of skilfully prepared material. Sixty institutions are now coöperating with the North Central Association in a study of new types of standards as may be indicated by objective tests. The College Entrance Examination Board is gradually placing more emphasis upon scientifically constructed tests. Prognosis tests in practically all subject-matter give significant indication of general and special abilities. The significance of a standardized testing program as a basis for improving the relations between schools and colleges has been demonstrated by the Pennsylvania Study.²² Professor Max McConn reports: "that educational guidance is now possible; that in individual schools and systems, it is an accomplished fact; and that it is certainly on its way into all the nation's schools."²³

²²*Report of the School and College Relations Committee.* Educational Records Bureau. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1933.

²³C. M. McConn: "Educational Guidance Is Now Possible." *The Educational Record*, 14:475-99 (October, 1933). See also by the same author: *Guidance.* National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 14. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

The school, if it were financially able, could make large and significant use of the knowledge which it is now possible to obtain about individual pupils, especially in relation to aid given to parents and pupils in the matter of the choice of college. College choice is too often determined by unwarrantable factors. The lack of parental wisdom in these respects may be laid partly to the inadequacy of school practices in guidance. Intelligent choice of the higher school could be linked directly and constructively to the abilities and interests of the pupil and to the character of the courses pursued.

5. Are there some types of secondary schools which are affected especially by college insistence upon preparation for advanced work?

There is a decided affirmative answer to this question in the case of the small high school. The average college prescribes seven units and recommends six more.²⁴ The small high school feels that it must include these in the program of studies. The average high school is dependent for the approval or accrediting of its work upon the quality of its preparatory work and the success of its graduates in college. The patrons of the school will not permit its graduates to be refused admission to higher institutions because of the school's failure to offer certain prescribed subjects.²⁵

Obviously the small high school suffers serious restrictions if it attempts to provide for at least thirteen academic units which are offered as preparation for advanced studies. In a school which has one hundred pupils, not more, probably, than twenty-five of the one hundred pupils will ever enter college. The suitability of college preparatory subjects to the majority of these pupils is, therefore, to be seriously questioned. Apparently the colleges have not as yet recognized the effect of college prescriptions upon the small high school. If there is any basis for the application of the theory and practice suggested in the second alternative of Issue Six, it could be especially directed to the small high school. Probably the small secondary school can do far more than has been done in the development of courses which would carry immediate function to its pupils. A broader conception of the obligations of the small high school is undoubtedly necessary. At the same time higher institutions could do a significant

²⁴F. E. Long: *The Organization of Secondary Education with Special Reference to the Small High School* (Ph. D. Thesis). New York: School of Education, New York University, 1928.

²⁵E. N. Ferris, W. A. Gaumnitz, and P. R. Brammell: *Smaller Secondary Schools*, National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 6. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

service by giving needful recognition to the handicap now placed upon small schools. There should be a definite attempt made to apply a new scheme of measuring individual pupil ability for college entrance without emphasis upon prescribed units and especially designed, if that be necessary, to free small schools so that attention could be adequately given to the immediate needs of the pupils concerned.

There are public secondary schools located in university centers or in highly select residential sections where the emphasis upon preparation for advanced studies is especially strong. The private school, as it is generally organized, is almost exclusively concerned with the deferred values of continuance in advanced studies. None of these schools can intelligently disregard the implications set forth by Issue Six. What is best for adolescent youth remains the dominant consideration educationally, regardless of the type of school. There seems to be small reason for not including all secondary schools in the challenges raised by the issue under discussion. Although the schools above mentioned are especially affected by college insistence upon preparation for advanced work, that relationship, as different from other schools, is only a matter of degree.

6. What may be expected of secondary schools relative to changes in subjects if colleges were to remove all restrictions upon subject-matter?

Until recently, although the evidence is slight, there seemed to be a large degree of satisfaction with the traditional program. High-school principals have indicated, when studies have been made, that changes in subject-matter were neither desirable nor necessary.²⁶ This attitude seemed as true in one part of the country as another.²⁷ Therefore it is reasonable to affirm that the secondary schools must accept a large share in the responsibility which accounts for the condition that supports preparation for advanced studies.

There is observable to-day much more indication of changing attitude on the part of secondary schools. This has been particularly true of a few of the private schools which with some public schools are leading a progressive movement which stresses the provision and development of immediate values. High-school principals everywhere are becoming more responsible to the implications of the issue, and associa-

²⁶H. M. Noles: *The Effects of the Entrance Requirements of the University of Colorado Upon Secondary Education in the State*. University of Colorado.

²⁷J. B. Davis: "Influence of College Entrance Requirements upon Schools of New England." *School Review*, XXXI:6, pp. 445-51 (June, 1923).

tions of secondary-school principals are studying the problem as never before. Many public schools, particularly the larger schools, are making sincere and far-reaching attempts to reduce the issue to the most practical solutions and are at the same time preparing pupils better for advanced study than ever before. More attention is constantly being given to the large number of pupils who are not going to college and there are significant changes being made in the character and treatment of the subject-matter offered such pupils.

There seems reason to assume that much more interest and action may be expected, in the immediate future, from secondary schools relative to the main issue under discussion. It is also becoming increasingly clear that high-school leaders sense a much deeper obligation than the mere removal of restrictions. The reorganization and adjustment of curriculum materials is recognized as a development which must go much farther and all subject matter must be determined and developed in the light of the needs and capacities not only of the pupils but for society as well.

Although the secondary school has sensed the importance of meeting the obligations mentioned above, there has been the general feeling that little could be done as long as the unit prescriptions of higher institutions remained in force. A large group of teachers and administrators within the secondary-school field would also question the advisability of rapid or extensive changes in curriculum material. They would point out that a sounder philosophy than now exists should be established.

If restrictions should in some miraculous way be removed, there would remain undoubtedly a strong conservative opinion which might for a time be even more manifest than now, as a result of fear of what might happen under the radical urge of unrestricted change. It would be reasonable to suppose, however, that the awakened interest in curriculum values, already referred to, would result in an increased effort in experimentation. The insistent realization that new and definite goals would have to be substituted for those removed, would not only challenge thought but require action. A new set of values would be demanded and once determined, subject materials would undergo the changes which necessity and ingenuity would suggest.

7. Would a definition by the colleges of their objectives and purposes aid in clarifying the issue?

It is fair to believe that higher institutions desire to insure the fitness of their students so that there may be resulting profit from the course pursued. There is grave question of the validity of the usual requirements in this respect.²⁸ Frequently the material demanded is not necessary or applicable or even required in college courses. This condition has been pointed out more definitely in other parts of this discussion.

A clarification of college aims and functions should prove of much assistance in the general solution of our problem. Colleges have a long way to go before they can approach what the secondary schools have done relative to statements of purpose and to efforts designed to translate objectives into function. Perhaps even slight attention to objectives would give belated recognition to that famous statement of the Committee of Ten that "what is good for education is also good for college entrance." It might also aid in developing the result that only pupils with adequate and properly organized preparation should be sent to college. Thus far, it seems, that colleges have defined admission requirements in terms of high-school subjects rather than in the expectation of what the college hopes to do for its entrants. Perhaps, as a result of more attention to aims colleges would be more interested in finding out what the large percentage of freshmen failures can and should do rather than in so much attention to the mere process of elimination.

In any development in this field it is assumed that there should be general recognition of the right of the individual college to define and declare the particular characteristics of the type of courses which can be given to the best advantage.

It may be argued also that secondary education needs to go much farther than it has in the defining of its objectives and the practical application of its offerings to these objectives. Much of the difficulty incident to the clarification of this issue is the result of confused ideas in respect to curriculum philosophy. If secondary education is to develop the thesis that it should be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses, it must first of all clarify its own philosophy and organize curriculum practices accordingly.

²⁸O. C. Trimble and H. H. Remmers: *Measures of Educational Outcomes versus Standards of Institutional Machinery as High-School Accrediting Criteria*. Purdue University Bulletin, XXXIII:7, 1933.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In the foregoing presentation an attempt has been made to discuss briefly the most important considerations raised by the Sixth Issue. The origin and development of the purpose of secondary education as preparation for advanced studies has been sufficiently traced to demonstrate the historical effect and the continuing force of this conception of secondary education.

The theory of secondary education as preparation for advanced studies has been analyzed and affirmed in the terms and understanding of those who lend it support. The philosophical and psychological relationships have been indicated and the constructive and influential phases have been pointed out.

This same type of treatment has been given to the opposing alternative of secondary education as primarily concerned with its own courses. As a result of this presentation of two divergent theories of secondary education emphasis has been placed on the importance of the issue and the need for a declarative position within the field of secondary education.

That the significance of the issue and the need for decision might be accentuated, a number of specific implications have been offered in the form of definite questions with some indication of the possible answers. Upon weighing all of the arguments offered in this presentation through long and careful discussion in advance of this appearance in print, the Committee arrived at a decision unanimously in favor of the alternative of secondary education as primarily concerned with its own courses. The general evidence from the world of reality and need; the logic of the broadest and most potential philosophy; the findings of the most hopeful and reasonable psychology; the richest opportunities to do most to meet the needs and capacities of the youth to be educated, all point to the tremendously significant obligation of the secondary school to accept responsibility for determining its own aims, functions, and practices. Adequate recognition of this obligation is paramount. To further emphasize the significance of a decision for secondary education as primarily concerned with its own courses and to indicate the possibilities of realization, there is discussion of ways and means of forwarding development and a number of brief suggestions as to implementation.

VI. THE ROLE OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL IN THE REALIZATION OF THE VALUES OF ITS OWN COURSES

Having set forth briefly some of the implications and obstacles which have hindered the realization of the second alternative, there remains a consideration of the means whereby these obstacles may be reduced or removed.

Concerted Recognition of the Need. Probably no rapid or satisfactory progress can be made toward the solution of many of the questions raised by our main issue until the various units of our educational system see the necessity for a unified approach to the entire problem. Meanwhile, the existing conditions, the educational implications and obligations, the opportunity for adjustment are most insistent within the secondary-school scene. If this be true, the logical deduction is that the secondary school must take the lead and make the changes and developments which will more rapidly and effectively conform to the needs of high-school youth, regardless of the college situation.

There are large numbers of high schools with a college preparatory qualification so slight as to be able freely to reorganize and create a curriculum based entirely upon the thesis of the second alternative. A marked trend once inaugurated by such schools would be of large and significant influence in bringing remaining schools to a new consciousness of the principles involved. At the same time, the higher institutions would be awakened to the changes and interested in arriving at a more satisfactory adjustment.

It is obviously true that with approximately all of the youth of high-school age in school in the near future, it becomes increasingly important for the school to meet adequately the needs and capacities of its pupils. Yet, this pronouncement needs no end of emphasis. It is also equally apparent that a comparatively small proportion of the membership of the school will immediately go to college; although a decade may bring about conditions which will greatly increase the number who will continue some form of education above the twelfth grade; but in any event such extension will merely emphasize the implications raised by general education and the significance of adapting that education to the needs of youth and society.

The logical and inevitable conclusion, relative to the situation at this time, does not support the traditional academic material of the college preparatory course, as suitable for any considerable number of pupils. The vastly changed conditions of the past few years and the immediate future, demanding new enlightenment on every hand, rigorously and imperatively require that the secondary school adjust itself rapidly and effectively to the solution of these pressing problems, regardless of the college-preparatory situation. Possibly it is no idle exaggeration to point out that if all pupils were definitely headed for college, the urgency of a change in secondary-school curricula to meet the new conditions of the present would be equally as necessary and desirable.

Possible Influence of Secondary-School Changes Upon College Entrance. The history of the secondary school discloses that the so-called domination of the college has over a long period increasingly diminished. The high school is to-day in a position sufficiently removed from college dictation and with enough standing of its own to clarify any educational issue which is peculiarly applicable to secondary education.

Unquestionably, the college cannot fail to be interested in high-school changes, particularly if high schools as organized professional bodies suitably request college coöperation. It is apparent, however, that secondary schools must take aggressive leadership in approaching mutual problems. If the high school is to convince college authorities that new subjects or reorganized old subjects must supplant the dominating position now held by college preparatory units, certain evidence must be presented.

Too often the high school has requested college recognition of a subject in which no adequate development had been made. With underlying philosophy in a state of disagreement and uncertainty; content doubtfully organized and poorly developed; standards of weight or measurement undetermined; and with methods of presentation halting and inadequate, the college has often looked askance, and rightly, upon such advances.

The fact remains that in the past the college has, to main degree, offered the one workable standard reasonably effective within the high-school situation. Although this is less true to-day, than formerly, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the quality of accomplishment and operation of the school

would in many instances decline at least for a time, if the college influence were entirely removed.

Secondary schools must see to it that new materials, courses, devices, and achievement are set up in conformity to specified and qualitative standards, fully justifiable from the high-school point of view. If this should be done well enough, there is reason to believe that higher institutions will grant the desired recognition.

Sufficient progress by the secondary school in the solution of its own problems will bring with relative rapidity a new conception of preparation for college. Some higher institutions have already pointed the way and the absence of listed and specified units of subject matter as required for admission seems to make no difference in the quality of college work. Reference should also be made to the large number of junior colleges which give ample evidence to the effect that students may be promoted from the twelfth grade of the senior high school to the first year of college either in state or private institutions as smoothly and effectively as from the eighth grade to the first year of high school. Colleges are discovering, too, what many secondary schools do not yet realize—that it is the quality of the personality, of demonstrated mental capacity, which is really important.

Suitable effort on the part of high schools, professional organizations, and regional associations should bring with reasonable rapidity the elevation of college entrance requirements to a satisfactory measurement of the individual pupil and his fitness, without recourse to the number of specified units. Such a plan of admission, if it did nothing else, would accomplish much by elimination of the prestige of certain subjects. The benefits therefrom would accrue fully as much to the college as to the secondary school.

VII. REORGANIZATION WITHIN THE SECONDARY-SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Concurrently with the needed effort to adjust college entrance requirements, the secondary school must carry out a reorganization of its curriculum offerings. Doubtless continued and persistent efforts on both fronts would react favorably upon both the college and the secondary-school phases of the problem.²⁹

²⁹F. T. Spaulding, O. I. Frederick, and L. V. Koos: *The Reorganization of Secondary Education*. National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 5. U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

If the high school is to enlist courageously and effectively under the banner of developing courses which are primarily designed and presented for immediate values, many subjects must be largely reorganized. Tool materials must be evaluated upon the basis of minimum efficiency. Specific courses designed for the acquirement of basic skills should be allocated according to the directive knowledge which is now available concerning the capacities of pupils. Correlative phases of desirable skills will need suitable recognition in the broader courses. A detailed discussion of the possibilities of reorganization within the secondary-school curriculum is presented in Issue Four.

That such reorganization and adjustment will be done easily or quickly is scarcely to be expected, no matter how clearly logical. That the movement is on the way and that the immediate future will witness accelerated activity is reasonably apparent. Trends of this character have been generally indicated in Monograph No. 5 of the National Survey of Secondary Education. Numbers of more detailed attempts may be readily ascertained. A dozen coöperative projects in the reconstruction of secondary education have been reported by the Society for Curriculum Study.³⁰ These present completely reorganized curricula in actual operation.

The avoidance of dangers incident to the necessary changes; the assurance that progress will be made with suitable care; the hope that action will rest upon sufficient analysis and adequate evidence will be largely determined by the attitudes and preparation of those who are now or may become secondary-school leaders and teachers. Undoubtedly, this is a large responsibility, but there is indication that the secondary-school field is awakening to the challenge as well as to the opportunity.

VIII. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

A. For the Secondary School

1. Instead of the traditional textual material, that an analysis be made of the child for needs, aptitudes, interests, talents, deficiencies, attitudes, so that the findings may be considered in relation to his environment and made the basis for secondary-school courses.

³⁰Society for Curriculum Study, Samuel Everett, editor: *A Challenge to Secondary Education*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1935.

2. The use of analysis results for formulation of curriculum material irrespective of college requirements.

a. Deficiencies in tool skills as the basis for what shall be offered as continuing fundamental material.

b. Needs and attitudes as the basis for integrated materials and individual development.

3. Determination of the influential factors within materials, activities, students' societies which make for integration and differentiation and the organization of these into both new and old courses.

4. Changes in the time allotment of all subjects and activities to conform with analysis findings suggested in (1).

5. Changes in the conventional disregard of social and economic factors in school experiences so that these may properly conform to the needs and interests of youth.

6. Changes and adaptations of subject materials and activities within courses to meet individual differences as well as the social needs of the group.

7. Provision for the continued addition of new subject matter and new applications within curriculums and within courses to meet immediacy of pupil needs and interests.

8. Continued effort in the determination and organization of current problems in terms of youth's needs.

9. Most fundamental materials of instruction, such as social needs, arranged for early high-school years, regardless of specific vocational or college preparatory requirements.

10. Constant testing of pupils whose accomplishment and bent are undetermined for discovery of best treatment and most suitable material.

11. Earnest effort on the part of the secondary school to take advantage of all the liberalization which the college offers.

12. Organization of traditional and formal material into experimental treatment for discovery of general and exploratory values with view toward best possible adaptation of them in a revised curriculum.

13. Definite applications of guidance practices before admitting pupils to specific or formal courses.

14. Definite attempts by the small high school to differentiate its courses and offerings to full realization of the

possibilities instead of uncritically accepting the traditional practice.

15. If additional specific subject matter is needed by individual pupils to meet college requirements, presentation of this subject matter additionally to the pupils concerned.

16. Restriction of college preparation to pupils who give evidence of fitness with adequate determination of the criteria of such fitness.

17. Refusal to offer training for the requirements of a specific college to a pupil when the provision of such training hinders the school in meeting the needs of other pupils, unless positive evidence is offered of special need for the type of further study offered by the college in question.

18. Acquaintance of parents with the effects of specific college requirements on the values to be gained from secondary-school work.

19. Other things being equal, the recommendation to pupils and their parents of colleges whose entrance requirements least hamper the secondary school in the achievement of its own proper objectives.

20. Development of a plan of guidance which adequately informs pupils and parents of the factors involved in a wise choice of college.

21. Acquaintance of the community with the desirability of judging the effectiveness of the school upon items other than what a few superior students do in college.

22. Adequate public dissemination of information concerning all the objectives and functions of the secondary school.

B. For Higher Institutions

1. Recognition of the secondary school's obligation to use the results of child analysis and social needs in selecting curriculum materials.

2. Allowance for the secondary school's needed recognition of integration and differentiation in respect to materials of study.

3. Recognition of the need for changes in time allotment of subject-matter to conform to the new demands made upon the high school such as those in respect to social and economic factors.

4. Consideration of the significance of the current needs of the adolescent and the psychological and practical implications of immediate values in curriculum matters.

5. Definition of college objectives in terms which may be understood by the secondary school, parents, and pupils.

6. Further emphasis upon the entire secondary-school record for qualities of intelligence, persistence, and workmanship rather than specific units of subject matter.

7. Specific subject requirements for college emphasized only in cases of intent for college continuance in advanced material within the same field.

8. Organization of the first year of college work to avoid needless duplication and to take advantage of what the secondary school has accomplished.

9. Recognition of the methods of instruction which have been found most effective in the secondary school with resulting avoidance of too abrupt changes in methods.

10. Consideration of a more equitable method than that of arbitrary decisions as to college entrance upon the basis of fractionally drawn lines, according to class rank. (Upper fifth, quarter, third).

11. Recognition of the differences between secondary schools in respect to standards, size of graduation classes, and other important phases.

12. Consideration of what a relatively large number of students from a single school do in college rather than upon what the currently enrolled one or more students do in a specific institution.

13. Consideration of the applicant's own intellectual and moral power as the most significant factor in college admission.

C. A Program of Coördinated Effort

1. Consideration of the development and organization of specifically required college-preparatory material for only such pupils as qualify for it through exploratory experience and guidance applications.

2. Recognition of the need for the organization of each year of the secondary school as valuable for itself in terms of immediate maximum worth.

3. Recognition of the desirability for placing specific materials designed for advanced studies as late in the secondary-school course as possible.

4. Concerted effort to place much emphasis upon the final year's scholastic record as the most indicative of college worth.

5. To reveal to teachers, principals, and college faculties the possibilities of desirable curriculum modifications: (a) assuming complete freedom, and (b) within the scope of present college entrance requirements.

6. Agreement to study the effects of the modifications suggested in (5) above.

7. To develop in collaboration plans of admission of maximum advantage to both the college and the secondary school.

8. Definite articulatory efforts in behalf of the student passing from the twelfth grade or the junior college to the higher institution.

9. Continued coöperative effort to free the ninth grade of the junior high school from college-preparatory specifications.

10. Mutual emphasis upon the discovery of the individual powers of the student as the most significant factor for admission to continued study.

11. Constant effort to interpret youth's problem in the light of the developing and changing world and to articulate the findings in a manner most conducive to youth's need, as progress is made from one level of education to another.

ISSUE VII

Shall secondary education accept conventional school subjects as fundamental categories under which school experiences shall be classified and presented to students, or shall it arrange and present experiences in fundamental categories directly related to the performance of such functions of secondary schools in a democracy as increasing the ability and desire better to meet socio-civic, economic, health, leisure-time, vocational, and pre-professional problems and situations?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

For a long time the school curriculum has been the center of controversy. New subjects have been admitted into it only after protracted debate or in the face of bitter protest. The controversy now enters a new phase. How should the curriculum be organized? Should the traditional subdivisions of knowledge be retained as the best basis for modifying the curriculum as needed, or should the curriculum be completely reorganized on the basis of what pupils should do in life? Educators do not agree on one or the other, nor is it likely that they will until they first agree on what the schools' job in society is and the best way to do it.

It is difficult to suggest in a few sentences what the schools' job in society is. But if we believe that in America the schools are established to perpetuate democratic society and to promote its interests, then they ought, as their first function, to develop in boys and girls the ability and the will to help organize and maintain a system of human relationships, determined by democratic processes, that places the general welfare of all above everything else and therefore imposes upon each individual the necessity of regulating his personal conduct accordingly. And as a preparation for winning the abundant life which such an organization of social relationships makes possible to all, it should also be the schools' function to teach youth how to use the natural resources of our continent to lay a firm economic basis for the general welfare of all and hence the individual welfare of each.

These two primary functions of the schools indicate the purposes the school curriculum should serve. As to the best

way to organize the curriculum, a regard for the laws which govern learning is essential to good results.

We now know that to be most successful learning must be meaningful to the pupil, it must grow out of his active experience, it must be intimately related to the development of his whole personality, it must provide him with emotional satisfactions, and it must be of ready use in the situations he meets in life. The traditional curriculum, which breaks up knowledge into separate compartments instead of drawing at any time upon any part of it which suits the pupil's needs, is in accord neither with the laws of learning nor the functions of the school. We need a new curriculum—one consciously designed and organized to serve the purposes of the school in the best way.

This curriculum is not easy to make. Also, long-established tradition would make it difficult to introduce it into the schools. Educators must therefore begin with the gradual transformation of the old curriculum to one more suited to their needs. What form it should eventually take is fairly clear. It should be divided into two kinds of learning activities in keeping with the double function of the school—to train boys and girls for coöperative action in a more equitable social order and to make them productive members of society. These two kinds of school activities, or major categories of the curriculum, should in turn be divided into minor categories representing the skills, or fields of competence, which all citizens should possess, and which should therefore be constants in the curriculum. Other minor categories, particularly those needed to provide vocational training and the specialization of abilities, should be included in the curriculum as electives to give such differentiation to the program of the school as the interests of society demand and the range of individual differences justify.

The exact details of a transitional plan are not the most important things, however, though a plan is presented here as indicative of what educators might begin with; what is most important is that educators should consider that the eventual establishment of a more rational curriculum in the schools is one of the greatest responsibilities of the profession. Then, in this knowledge, they should lose no time and spare no effort in gradually introducing into the schools a new curriculum based on what the present and future activities of the pupil, properly socialized, should be, and so integrated with these activities as to constitute a psychological

unit. Such a curriculum would be in line with the schools' functions and with what we know about how children learn.

I. SCHOOL CURRICULA AND THE SCHOOLS' FUNCTIONS

The Reality of This Issue. In American high schools to-day, we find curricula organized in two ways. Under the more common type of organization, the subjects of the curriculum are grouped into departments, such as history or science. What is taught in each of these departments is organized into subjects—American history, or botany, for instance. Each of these subjects is further subdivided into sections or topics such as electricity in the subject of physics, or the reconstruction period in American history. The arrangement of these under each subject heading and of the subjects in each department in what appears to text-book writers, principals, department heads, and teachers as a logical order of presentation to children constitutes the "conventional" organization of the curriculum. It enjoys the sanctity which practice, when extended both in time and space, often bestows.

Another type or organization, newer and more infrequent, but, nevertheless, beginning to appear, especially at the junior high-school level, disregards more or less completely the conventional plan of organization, substituting some other categories which seem to agree more closely with the functional use of knowledge. Not only are a few clear-cut examples of complete departure from the use of subjects as categories beginning to appear, but text-book writers with a wet finger in the wind, are attempting to incorporate other than subject-categories into their text-books on certain subjects. For instance, in a recently published biology, one finds a section entitled, "How is Human Life Conserved?" In a civics of about the same publication date, there is a unit entitled, "Good Health and How to Get It." Perusal of the contents shows that the biology has dipped deeply into the field of community civics and that the civics has drawn heavily upon science. This is indicative that there is a real effort to discover new and "more fundamental" categories that the practical-minded publishing companies, always sensing but seldom, if ever, creating a trend, are constrained to take into account. What these new categories are to be, it is too soon to state, but the examples listed in the statement of this

issue are offered as indicative of the existence of such a trend and are, furthermore, indicative of what this Committee considers to be fundamentally irreconcilable in the nature of the two plans of curriculum organization. The Committee, therefore, holds that there are now two distinct types of curriculum organization based upon two very different points of view in education. The older one dominates current educational practice. In the judgment of this Committee, theory is at sharp variance with common practice. The two should be consistent. One set of categories should not be required by educational theory and another used in practice. One set should be accepted and all others rejected. The curriculum cannot serve two masters. The issue is, therefore, a real one.

When Are Categories "More Fundamental"?—The Influence of Social Philosophy. Since it can be safely assumed that all will admit that the categories into which a school's curriculum is divided should be fundamental rather than either artificial or superficial, we may pass directly to a consideration of the question of what makes one set of categories more fundamental than another. This Committee holds that how the school curriculum is organized, which is a basic question raised in this issue, as well as what shall be included in the content of the curriculum, should be determined by the function of the school in the society in which it exists. The curriculum of any school, public or private, is essentially the means by which those responsible for establishing the school and those responsible for sending children to it provide for these children what is considered to be an appropriate and desirable education. The form and content of the curriculum of every school system is and always has been retained without change, or is and always has been modified from time to time either on the basis of thought, experiment, tradition, prejudice, emotion, or the lack of these, as those in control of the system decide upon what is an appropriate and desirable education for the young. The only reason for the existence of any curriculum or for organizing it in any particular way is the better to accomplish the function served by the school. The organization of the curriculum into categories which may be said to be fundamental, therefore, implies that they promise the maximum contribution toward a realization of the function of the school. This committee believes that any categories under which the school curriculum is organized should be as fundamental as it is possible for those in charge of the school to conceive of them and that their fundamentalness is.

dependent upon the closeness of the fit between them and the function of the school.

The various sections of this report, written by the different members of this Committee, show them to be in rather close agreement with respect to the special functions of the public school in our American representative democracy. Innumerable statements found in the discussion of the issues support either implicitly or explicitly the points of view presented by Briggs in his "Golden Rules" and in his "investment theory of education"¹ and show a common agreement as to the function of a school in a society. These statements go further than those Briggs makes in that they exhibit a social philosophy which modifies their meaning. Taken by themselves, the three statements of Briggs point out that the representatives of the State decide what are the "desirable things" and the "higher activities" on the basis of what it considers to be likely to help "preserve itself," "promote its own interests," and make itself "a better place in which to live and in which to make a living." This is to say that they show how the function of the school in *any* state is decided upon. The statements written by members of this committee go further in that they reflect what the members of this Committee think are the functions of the public school when a State committed to representative democracy is assumed. What that State should, in this Committee's judgment, set up as goals toward which to work is shown by the condensed and paraphrased statement of the National Education Association's Committee on Socio-Economic Goals of America which is incorporated into the discussion of the ninth Issue. Summarized, and stated in the words of the present writer, this Committee holds that a representative democracy is a form of social organization in which each person agrees with all other members of the society so to organize group life that each has an opportunity *to grow*; to develop; to attain to the highest level of welfare within the limits of his ability so long as in his efforts thus to advance his own welfare he does not, in the opinion of the majority, begin to deny a similar opportunity to others. When so defined this *ipso facto* becomes an order whose primary concern is to so arrange group life that progressively higher levels of human living are continuously sought and attained by all until eventually the highest level of life attainable

¹T. H. Briggs: *Secondary Education*, pp. 258-267; pp. 209-224. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933. See also by the same author: *The Great Investment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

within the limits of the intelligence of the people and the natural resources available for use is achieved. It thus moves toward what this Committee believes to be the most ideal life-level possible for human beings on earth.

This Committee further holds that the application of the specifications advanced by Briggs to such a social organization suggests that the schools and all other educative agencies in a society have two functions: first, that of developing the ability and creating the will in each person so to organize and maintain human relationships that the maximum opportunity for growth, development, and welfare can and will be available for all; and second, that of creating and developing the ability to use and manage the natural resources of the society's physical environment so that they will contribute maximally to the growth, development, and welfare of all.

Therefore, this committee believes that if the categories into which the curriculum of the public secondary school in America is divided are really fundamental ones, they will show an inherent and intrinsic relationship to the performance of these proposed functions of the school. One of our major tasks is, consequently, to examine the alternatives of this issue to determine which of them seems the more likely to enable the school to perform effectively these functions.

The argument so far would seem to imply that the decision as to when categories are fundamental should be made solely upon philosophical grounds. Such, however, is not the case. Since the functions of the school, as set out above, are dynamic ones requiring the secondary-school's program to produce changes and developments in youth—that is, to modify and accelerate growth,—decision will be based partly upon psychological factors. The best organization of the curriculum will take into account, first, not only *what* the society wants to accomplish by its school curriculum, but next, *how* this can best be done. When the answer to the first question must include the production and modification of growth in individuals, as it does in a democracy, then the answer to the second question involves the psychology of learning. Acceptable curricular categories must square with psychology as well as philosophy. As from philosophy we have asked what kind of a life situation should we want, so from psychology we must ask how is growth in individuals most effectively produced, modified, and accelerated?

When Are Categories "More Fundamental"?—The Influence of Educational Psychology. What do we know about the

psychology of learning which has to be taken into account in organizing a curriculum for secondary schools and in deciding what categories should be used? This Committee thinks that the following propositions are of fundamental importance.

1. Learning proceeds more rapidly and tends to be more permanent when relationships between what is being experienced and the welfare of the learner are seen by him. Because of this it is said that the learning situation should be "meaningful;" "interest" must be present, or the learner must "give attention." In childhood and adolescence the "welfare" is conceived of as something relatively personal and immediate; with increasing intellectual maturity the learner may be equally well motivated by a relationship to welfare which he recognizes as more remote, impersonal, abstract, and intellectual. He is more likely than the immature to demand that this relationship be seen and accepted.

2. Learning proceeds more rapidly and tends to be more permanent when it is an outgrowth of, or a development from, the experience of the learner. This is a corollary of the above. Therefore, it is said learning proceeds "from the known to the unknown" or that we must "build on the past experience of the learner." The greater the degree of intellectual maturity attained by the learner the more experience there is to build upon.

3. Learning proceeds more rapidly and tends to be more permanent in proportion to the amount of satisfaction the learner derives from the process of learning, and in proportion to the immediacy of the satisfaction. With the increasing intellectual maturity of the learner, the attainment of the satisfaction by the learner may be longer delayed with less danger of interfering with or inhibiting learning. On the other hand such a learner has more definite ideas about what values or satisfactions are to him worth a sustained effort. He is not only a more persistent but a more critical learner. The type of satisfaction must, therefore, vary from such elemental goals as having hunger appeased to more intellectual goals such as preparing for a state bar examination. Consequently, we read that immediate values are more potent than "remote" ones; "nothing succeeds like success;" learning should be an "enjoyable process"; and that for effective learning every learner must have a "worthy purpose." The second "function" elaborates upon the effect of this idea upon secondary education.

4. Learning proceeds more rapidly and tends to be more permanent when it involves activity—physical and mental—on the part of the learner. This is true whether the activity is simple like “looking it up in the dictionary” or complex like functioning as a member of a student government body. With increasing intellectual maturity the character of desirable learning activities tends to become more highly organized whether mental or physical, more socially significant and to require a longer period of sustained application. If it is self-initiated activity, so much the better as this is indicative that the relationship to one’s own welfare called for in 1 above probably is apparent to the learner.

5. The probability that what is learned will later be recalled for use when needed increases in proportion as the learning situation resembles that in which the learning is used or applied. High degrees of intellectual ability and maturity probably supply sheer ability to bridge long gaps between the learning—and the use-situations, but there is no advantage in leaving longer gaps than absolutely necessary. The common error in the secondary school is to over estimate the power of the learner to carry over from the learning—to the use-situation. Thus it is argued that “schools should be life-like;” that activities should be “drawn from life,” and that Briggs’ Golden Rules indicate the general nature of the curriculum.

6. The probability that what is learned will later be recalled for use when needed increases in proportion as the relationships between each element (skill, idea, fact, ideal) which is being learned and the other elements being learned is understood by the learner. It is greatest when many relationships between the elements being-learned-in-relation-ship and a larger more complete “whole” situation are seen by the learner. Carried to the ultimate in a perfect learning and living situation, learning would result in these various “whole” situations ultimately dissolving into one whole situation including all of one’s experience, every element of which would be in harmony with all other elements with no seeming incongruities, no contradictions, and no divided loyalties. For these reasons “isolated” learnings are disparaged and it is hoped by “integrated” learning to contribute to the development of as completely “integrated” personalities as current living will permit. Higher degrees of intellectual ability and maturity account for more of these elements being “on hand” to be related to any new ones being experienced and for

greater ability independently to see new relationships. They, also, account for greater ability to see the lack of relationship, the incongruities, the contradictions, and the evil resulting from these. The necessity, if not the difficulty, of providing for these seen relationships increases with intellectual maturity.

The ability to learn persists throughout life. It is because of this that programs of adult education are defensible and that some argue against childhood education becoming a "preparation for future living" and against its being a process of "storing for future use." With intellectual maturity comes a "present life" of greater depth, breadth, and vista. There is, also, a cumulative ability to learn and to use what is learned, which will remain and perhaps increase throughout most of life. There is, therefore, no reason whatever for the education of this type of learner being chiefly concerned with what is to him "future-living" in the sense that it is more remotely related to what he recognizes as "present life."

The Committee's Deductions. This Committee, on the basis of the social philosophy outlined in earlier portions of this discussion in combination with these basic considerations drawn from the field of psychology, makes the following deductions which, in its judgment, are of major importance in planning a curriculum for our secondary schools.

1. *The content of the curriculum must be socially justifiable.* If we accept the investment theory as binding upon the schools of a democracy, defining the latter term as we have defined it herein, then the curriculum must be a direct and positive effort so to educate youth that they will be able and desirous of making this country a better place for all to live and to make a living in.

2. *The content should be drawn from or related to the students' experience.* Only thus can it be meaningful to him and best incite the degree of interest and attention essential to effective learning.

3. *The content must involve what he recognizes or can be brought to recognize as of interest to him because it involves his welfare or the welfare of others for whom he is concerned.* Only that portion of experience recognized by the student as having a bearing on his welfare and satisfaction or that of others for whom he is concerned has maximum value in promoting learning.

4. *The content of the curriculum should either extend the students' experience horizon or better relate what is already within it.* If content meets the requirements of the proposition listed as 1 above and does either of the two things listed in this deduction, it will result in the largest possible amount of socially justifiable kinds of growth in each student.

5. *The content of the curriculum should involve a large quantity and wide variety of activities in which students can engage with a satisfying degree of success.* Learning is effectively carried on only when the learner becomes active. Other things being equal, more activity usually results in more learning. Therefore, the need for a "large quantity." The "variety" is required because identical activity cannot grow out of the past experience of all learners and because, on account of individual differences, all cannot engage in one activity with a degree of success requisite to effective learning.

6. *Most of the activities should be coöperative ones involving participation of all the members of the whole group. Individual activities may be fitted into this group activity and seen by each worker as his personal contribution to the success of the group project.* Successful democratic social organization requires from each person ability to plan, decide, and work coöperatively with others, and willingness to work for the common good. These are not inherited qualities, but they can be learned and should be outcomes of an educational program in a democracy.

7. *The activities included as curriculum content should be organized into situations which are as like ideal democratic life as possible without losing reality by loss of contact with the students' experience.* Ideally the process of democratic living would itself result in each person's becoming appropriately educated. Under these conditions the activities of living would be the content of the curriculum, and life itself the school. Under existing conditions, however, the schools' curriculum must create a learning situation which better exemplifies democracy's ideals than does current life. Therefore, the curriculum should include activities from engaging in which children learn how to carry on better the "desirable activities" in which they are likely to engage. It should also include other "higher" activities related to and growing out of the likely ones and make them "desired and to a maximum extent possible." The curriculum situations should be as life-like as possible because the extent to which

these activities will become desired and seem possible to learners will vary in proportion to the extent to which they are seen as related to and an outgrowth of their lives.

8. *The curriculum should be organized to permit and encourage the development of specialized abilities in socially valuable ways.* Progress in a society depends upon the amount and degree of development of specialized abilities, provided the development is along such socially valuable lines as helping to make that society "a better place in which to live and to make a living." For maximum results to society the learner should understand that the development of his special abilities is provided at public expense on the expectation that they are to be used by him for the public good.

9. *The curriculum should recognize the increasing degree of intellectual maturity of the learners.* By definition the secondary school is to accept "all normal" adolescents. It is to retain them, if possible, until "able effectively to participate in society unguided by the school" or until they are ready for the higher schools. (See Introduction, PP. 13-14). This implies a student-body of wide ranges of intellectual ability and of varying degrees of intellectual maturity. The curriculum must, as far as possible, provide for effective learning for all. These differences call for proper adjustments both in content and method. These differences call for greater change in content than in method, however, because they affect *what* can be learned and the *rate* of learning more than *how* learning goes on, as can be seen by noting the comments on intellectual maturity in connection with the preceding seven statements on the psychology of learning.

10. *The curriculum should recognize that living, learning, and growing are inherently and intrinsically interrelated and any attempt to separate or isolate one from the other tends to stop all three.* Whether one is primarily interested in a plan of living, a kind of learning, or a rate of growth, he cannot seek it directly and independently of the other two with as much success as when he recognizes and utilizes the interrelationship of the three. Living, learning, and growing, therefore, when sought interrelatedly lead to the maximum amounts of further living, learning, or growing in an endless spiral. This life-spiral, however, without a guiding purpose may be either an ascending or a descending spiral with reference to any particular set of social, economic, or ethical ideals. In human living, even in its lowest forms, some intelli-

gence enters in to provide at least a little of guiding purpose. As intelligence enters more largely into living, it gives more direction and guidance to life, and hence special kinds of more definitely conceived learning and growing come to be more consciously sought for as results. That is to say, society seeks definitely to assure itself that the spiral is an ascending one in relation to its scale of values. If, as a part of this more intelligent seeking for results, schools are established by a society, they must be organized so that living, learning, and growing all go forward together, and whatever helps accomplish this result becomes part of the real curriculum of the school. As a result of taking this curriculum, boys and girls must live more enriched lives within the school, as society judges that life, than they otherwise would, or else society will conclude that not enough learning and growing has resulted from public education to justify its expense.

Both the content and the organization of the curriculum must, in the judgment of this Committee, meet the demands implicit in the foregoing deductions. We have argued that any proposed categories, to be acceptable, must show some apparent relation to the function of the curriculum of the school in a democracy. It must now be evident, also, that any proposed categories should contribute maximally to effective learning. The alternatives of this issue must, therefore, be examined now to discover which promises the more toward the effective performance of the secondary schools' designated functions in a democratic society. The arguments for and against each alternative of the issue may be summarized as follows:

II. CONVENTIONAL- SUBJECTS ORGANIZATION OF THE CURRICULUM

The Affirmative Argument.

1. *It has been successful.* For generation upon generation back to antiquity schools of all countries have used subjects as the basis for the organization of their curricula. All that schools have contributed to the culture and progress of the world has been the direct result of curricula so organized and taught. A plan of organization tested and approved under so many such and diverse conditions should not be lightly cast aside for another relatively untried plan supported chiefly by theoretical arguments.

2. *It can meet present needs.* Granting the validity of the proposed functions, it can be admitted that some conventional subjects, or parts of subjects, at present contribute little, if anything, in present day America toward their achievement. But this is not a fatal weakness of a curriculum organized on conventional subject lines. What is needed is not an abandonment of the plan, but the elimination of some subjects and the inclusion of others with greater possibilities of contributing to these functions. Such a process of omitting and adding subjects, as occasion has demanded, has been going on for ages. An impartial evaluation of subjects in the light of these functions with eliminations and additions recommended as a result, will meet the situation. The defense of the curriculum organized into conventional subjects need not involve and cannot fairly be charged with the necessity of the defense of every subject exactly as it has been or is now taught.

Moreover, good teachers of conventional subjects have always been able to inculcate in pupils the ideals and habits demanded by the state. If the State is not now satisfied with results, it is more largely due to failure on the part of the State clearly to formulate what it expects from the school than to faulty structure of the curriculum. The best remedy is not a new and different curriculum organization, but better teaching of conventional subjects by teachers guided by a more concisely formulated social policy.

3. *It is most practical in the light of present and most probable future conditions in the schools.* Public secondary education involves for the teacher five or six classes per day of from twenty to forty pupils. There is small chance that this general condition will soon materially change. Under such conditions of mass instruction, a subject-organized curriculum with the use of one or more good texts and such auxiliary devices as are commonly used with them, becomes the most practical method known for carrying forward an educational program. Departing from it to get superior results will increase instructional costs far beyond present levels and cost more per unit of gained superiority than improved subject teaching will cost. The logical organization of conventional subjects, often considered their weakness, may, under present teaching conditions, be their greatest strength.

4. *The education of teachers and the organization of teaching materials in textbooks and reference books require*

the use of a curriculum organized on subject-lines. Granted that the proposed functions of the school receive general public support, more progress can more quickly be made toward achieving these functions through conventional subjects than by shifting to a new basis of organization. The training and experience of teachers, the arrangement and content of text books, the ideas of parents on the subject, and the types of buildings and equipment are practical considerations which cannot be brushed aside. All of these favor an effort to achieve the schools' proposed functions through redirected teaching of subjects.

5. *A subject-curriculum in conjunction with a guidance program will attain desired results.* If the administration of the curriculum were improved with the result that a wise choice of subjects were made by each pupil, many of the shortcomings now charged to subject-teaching would vanish. The fault lies not so much in the use of subjects as the basis of organization as in the lack of adequate guidance as techniques and failure to use the available ones to the full. Any other plan of curriculum organization, unless involving a more careful adjustment of individual programs to an individual's abilities, capacities, interests, and needs, than now used, will fall at least as far short of perfection as conventional subjects now do. Before we consider the abandonment of the present plan of curriculum organization in favor of a relatively untried one, the effectiveness of the present plan in conjunction with an adequate guidance program should first be ascertained.

6. *Subject-organization of the curriculum is necessary in specialized or differentiated education.* It is commonly admitted that provision for specialized education becomes more and more the major function of secondary education as the age of the student increases. Such education involves the acquisition of complete and concise information and skill in a relatively narrow field. Subjects provide for this in a systematic and convenient form. Moreover, subject-organization of knowledge gives the teacher and student the ready means of reference so necessary while the student is in the process of gaining competence in his field of specialization. If there were other and better ways of organizing the content of a specialized field, the engineering, legal, and medical professions would long ago have begun its use.

In summary, the advocates of conventional subject-teach-

ing, though admitting the desirability of greater emphasis on present day functions of the school, contend that this does not require the abandonment of the present organization of the curriculum and hold that more improvement can be more expeditiously accomplished by better efforts at subject-teaching than by the substitution of another relatively untried plan so foreign to the training and experience of all who would teach and administer it. They contend that the burden of proof lies with the proponents of reorganization and their case will be made only when they have removed all reasonable doubts as to its wisdom.

The Negative Argument.

1. *Conventional-subject organization of the curriculum interferes with and often prevents the public school from performing its legitimate functions.* The "investment theory" sets up functions which have not been denied. Present subjects were organized with other purposes in mind. Learning their content is such a roundabout and indirect means of promoting the functions of the school that both teacher and pupil lose sight of them. The content has not been selected with this purpose in mind, so only by chance could it effectively accomplish the schools' purpose, which (if present at all) is thus obscured for the learner. Attempts to modify subjects in the direction of the proposed functions is an indirect and half-hearted admission of the need for reorganization and still does not promote the schools' purposes very effectively.

2. *It resists change to meet current social and educational needs.* The underlying theory of the subject-curriculum is the gaining of possession of a definite body of knowledge, largely because this body of knowledge exists. This favors a static concept of society and education. It, therefore, resists change; it promotes a complacent and socially-detached attitude on the part of teachers. It is, therefore, constitutionally opposed to the current concept of the dynamic nature of society and its schools.

3. *It is an expensive way of attempting to perform the schools' functions as proposed.* The traditional content includes much material which does not contribute to the achievement of the schools' functions. To teach it involves waste of time and money. Attempts to eliminate this type of material have been relatively unsuccessful. Efforts to include in the curriculum new material and new subjects to meet new de-

mands when resistance to change has been successfully overcome, have resulted in needless and illogical duplication of content. This, also, leads to waste of time and money. Attempts to effect a compromise solution are thus seen to be costly and ineffective.

4. *It tends to set up education as an end in itself whereas if secured at public expense, it should be regarded as a means of promoting effective group and personal living.* The logical organization of subject-matter promotes an attitude on the part of the learner of "the subject for the sake of the subject"; of "education for education's sake." This is a modern carry-over of scholasticism. It tends to divorce knowledge from conduct whereas the provision of education at public expense requires that knowledge be validated by the kind of conduct its possession produces. Socially bad learning habits are thus fostered and socially desirable kinds of personal growth and development are thus retarded.

In summary, conventional-subject organization is weak because it does not effectively assist the school in the performance of its present day functions; it resists effort at modification; cannot be modified to effect a great improvement; and tends to divorce knowledge gained in school from the necessity for it in and out of school. New categories should, therefore, be found and substituted for the subject-organization of the curriculum.

III. A CURRICULUM BASED ON "MORE FUNDAMENTAL" CATEGORIES

The Affirmative Argument.

1. *They will better achieve present-day functions of the school.* If one admits the social responsibility of the school in the degree implied by this Committee or in any lesser degree, the curriculum should represent a forthright attempt at the achievement of those functions. It should be organized into categories, courses, or units (or whatever divisions might prove most useful), the purposes of each of which are directly related to the functions of the school. The whole curriculum and all its parts should be a direct and positive attempt by the school to promote the kind of growth in students sought by society and therefore declared by it to be the function of the school. When this is done the results will be better because the purposes will be more clearly seen by both teachers and pupils, the activities and materials of the class-

room will be more appropriately selected, and the resulting amount of the desired learning, therefore, increased.

2. *They will tend to make schools as dynamic as is the society in which they are situated.* In a dynamic society, social purposes change in the direction of what society considers to be to its best interests. The functions of the school, under the "investment theory," will change in accord with social purposes. Thus the schools' curriculum becomes dynamic. This would tone the whole educative effect of the school environment through establishing a closer relation between life in school and outside of it. The growth of teachers in service would be promoted; teaching materials and content would be more nearly "up-to-date," and the relation between learning in school and effective living in the school and in society in general would be clearly apparent.

3. *They will be more economical and effective.* Content which is functionless (i. e., does not promote the kinds of growth implied by the schools' functions) will be eliminated and time and money saved. What content is left and what is added will be organized best to promote the kinds of growth desired. The resulting "streamlined" curriculum will produce more economy and effectiveness in learning. The curriculum (Latin meaning "race") will then be down a straightaway course toward a known goal. Teachers and students will "go to their marks" with a common idea of the course to be run and the location of the finish-line.

4. *They will be psychologically sound.* Organizing the curriculum in "more fundamental" categories increases the probability of a seen relationship between what pupils are expected to learn and a need, interest, or known condition of the life of the learner. This increases the rate of learning and lengthens the period of retention.

It also increases the amount of integrated learning. When all content is selected on the basis of realizing one or more of the schools' functions and when the different items of content are arranged in relation to each other for the achievement of these functions, it will be more probable that the relationships between different items of content and between them and the whole content will be more clearly seen. This will mean that subject-matter is better integrated and, therefore, more easily learned, longer retained, and better understood. Moreover, since the functions of the school, which the curriculum is organized to support, are, themselves, drawn

from life under the "investment theory" as this Committee interprets it, the whole curriculum will for the learner be better integrated with life itself. This makes probable a better and clearer understanding of the relationship between what one learns to do in school, and what needs to be done outside of school with a probable greater "carry-over" between knowledge and conduct and between school and life outside of it. Also, the more one "specializes" in his education, the more deeply will he become involved in the relationship of his advanced knowledge and techniques to life and its needs. This kind of specialized or differentiated education will be socially profitable, whereas now social profit, if any, is a mere incident to the further pursuit of still more highly specialized knowledge.

5. *It tends toward an education that functions in life.* The proposed reorganization along more fundamental lines will be an improvement, also, because it shifts the emphasis from content to method. Content under it becomes a means to an end which under the "investment theory" is the growth and development of pupils as needed by the State. The kinds of growth and development desired will change from time to time, thus requiring new content. The content of the curriculum, at any one time, cannot, therefore, be regarded as anything sacred and inviolate. The really important thing is how to use the content to get the desired growth. This means that the importance of methods, of teaching, and learning is magnified. In a dynamic society no fixed content of the secondary-school's curriculum can be expected to suffice throughout life, but methods of learning, of studying, of experimenting and of testing results can be. When this shift of emphasis is made, there will be a greater tendency to fix these learning habits and, therefore, a greater probability that they will remain to function throughout life. "More fundamental" categories are, therefore, held to be indispensable to making under the "investment theory" education socially effective in the schools of a dynamic society.

The Negative Argument.

1. *Teachers cannot adjust to the change.* Teachers have been educated in college in the fields of subject matter. In service they have attained further skill and more knowledge. Shifting to "more fundamental" categories as proposed would call for a professional education of an entirely different kind. It would disqualify present teachers for further service and

there are no others with the new type of professional education which would be required.

2. *The shift-over to the proposed organization would be too expensive.* Many features of present school buildings would be useless or would need much remodeling. Additional features would need to be built. Much present equipment would have to be abandoned or reinstalled. Even texts and supplies would be affected. The whole plan involves expense that cannot be met even if it were justified.

3. *Inadequate provision for specialization is made.* If we admit for purposes of argument, that the "more fundamental" categories, being broader and more composite, might be accepted as the basis for general education, we still have the problem of adequate specialized education. The interests and abilities of pupils as well as the needs of society demand that in its later years secondary education be increasingly concerned with specialized education. Fundamental categories will need to be subdivided for teaching purposes if specialized education is to be provided. If this is done, we get back to subdivisions akin to present subjects so the reorganization comes to naught as far as the differentiating function of education is concerned.

The proposed change in plan of curriculum organization is, therefore, impractical, extravagant, and does not provide for differentiated education any better than now.

The Committee's Summary. If the "investment theory" is sound—and its validity has not been challenged—then the curriculum should show both in form and content a direct, positive, and specific effort to protect and promote the interests of the State and to make it a better place in which to live and make a living. No one claims that conventional subjects came into use as curricular categories with this purpose in mind. The oldest and most representative of the conventional subjects entered the curricula of public secondary schools in America through uncritical acceptance of European educational tradition. The newer and less conventional ones entered largely through demands of the public for a "more practical" education, and, therefore, can lay some claim to being "fundamental" according to the definition above. The reluctance with which these newer offerings have been accepted by the advocates of the traditional curriculum, however, does not augur well for depending upon revising the subject-curriculum as a method of

making it harmonize with the demands of the "investment theory."

1. It would, therefore, seem that the best claim that the advocates of conventional subjects can make for them is that a good teacher can *make* them perform many of the functions demanded of the school by the "investment theory." Considering their origin, it is too much to expect that conventional subjects will be of great assistance to teachers in achieving the function of the school as proposed by the "investment theory" except by mere chance. The content of these subjects was selected without reference to any such function. Each item was primarily selected because of its importance in and to the subject itself and with reference to its use and value in further study of similar subject-matter. The test was "does it help to cover the subject?" Inspired teaching of these subjects has helped and will, to some extent, help achieve the proposed function of the school, though chiefly through concomitant learnings, but to expect teachers to attain satisfactory results under such conditions is like expecting a tap-dancer to perform in rubber boots. All of this is to say that good teachers get good results of a kind, in some measure, in spite of the organization of the curriculum. A good curriculum organization should assist, not handicap, the teacher in achieving the schools' functions. The "more fundamental" (as defined) the categories are, the more nearly will this be true.

2. If the plan sometimes proposed by advocates of the subject-organized curriculum of gradually bringing the content of the present curriculum as organized more into harmony with the demands of the "investment theory," is followed, the argument of the "more fundamental" category group has been admitted in a sort of "left-handed," indirect manner. By such a process the conventional subjects are made less and less conventional in order that they may become more and more functional. They thus try to conform to the proposed categories. As an *ad interim* practice to be followed during a period of transition from the present form of the curriculum to one using "more fundamental" categories, this proposal might be accepted, but it is a tacit admission of the weakness of conventional subjects as curricular categories. The necessity for a period of adjustment between present curriculum practice and the proposed plan is admitted. This should be long enough to permit teachers to develop power to handle the new type of teaching materials and situations and to permit of other neces-

sary adjustments in equipment, buildings, text materials, etc. Allowing for the gradual introduction of the new program evaporates most of the arguments against it based upon cost and impracticability.

3. The advocates of conventional subjects as curricular categories must seek refuge in the illogical position that the curriculum need bear no fundamental relation (as defined above) to the functions of the school as set up in the "investment theory" and as applied by this Committee to the American secondary school or they must propose and secure approval of another function for the schools in this country and show that conventional subjects are the fundamental curricular categories when such a function is assumed. Until the proponents of conventional subjects do this, their position is unsound and subject to attack on its social and educational philosophy.

4. Conventional-subject organization of the curriculum is weak because there is no essential and inherent relation between subject-categories and the kinds of growth in youth which the accomplishment of the proposed function of the school requires. Effective and economical efforts to produce these kinds of growth call for categories which bear a relation to what it is proposed to accomplish through the curriculum. Attempts to produce these growths on a subject basis mean that some kinds are not attained at all, while some are sought through two or more subjects at needless duplication of expense. Frequently the natural learning situations of school life are butchered up and divided among the several departments and subjects so each may have at least a little really "live" subject-matter. Therefore, from the viewpoint of sociology, since present subject-categories were not established on the basis of their relationship to the desired kinds of growth they should be abandoned in favor of "more fundamental" categories which more effectively achieve the functions of the school because selected with the promotion of certain desired kinds of growth definitely in mind.

5. Conventional-subject organization of the curriculum is weak psychologically because there is no essential relationship between its content and the life youth is participating in, either directly or vicariously. Experimental psychology, as previously explained, affirms that the best learning situations—leading to most growth—are intrinsically bound up with living. Present subjects are not, therefore, necessarily the best means for promoting desirable growth. Many subjects when originally

included in the curriculum did serve such a function, at least in part. The conditions of life which accounted for the inclusion of some of our best examples of conventional subjects in the curriculum have so changed that they no longer serve such a purpose to any respectable degree. Some other subjects now do so to an extensive degree, but in none has or can the full possibility of interrelating living, learning, and growing be as fully realized as it can be when the curricular categories bear an intrinsic relation to the kinds of growth demanded by the approved functions of the school as set out by this Committee.

6. The logical organization of content involved in conventional subjects is not defensible. Even if subjects had been selected with present approved functions in mind, they would still be subject to attack because in a conventional subject the content is usually arranged logically chiefly with reference to facilitating the learning of such subject matter. The chief value of logically organized knowledge is for the use of a learner as a convenient source of reference when and as necessary to the attainment of a desired goal in action or in thought. Used thus, a learner turns aside from his main activity to acquire the needed information just as any other worker pauses momentarily in his work to pick up the tools or materials he next needs. This pictures a vastly different use of logically arranged subject-matter than obtains in conventional subject-courses where "picking up tools and materials" frequently becomes, for most students, an activity without any purpose unless it be to become more expert in picking up similar tools and materials. They pass through what to them are unreasonably difficult mazes of subject-matter toward remote, poorly seen, and often little desired ends for achievement in which they sometimes find the skills acquired in threading the maze to be of little consequence. This logical arrangement of content is inherent in conventional subjects and their adoption as categories requires acceptance of this arrangement of content without the necessity of providing a validating purpose for the learner. If the proponents of conventional subjects deny this, and suggest rearrangement of content of *each* subject into a better order for learning they then propose to accept the psychology of their opponents as it applies to the arrangement of the content of each subject but to reject it as it applies to the arrangement of all the subjects of the curriculum. This is a fatal admission, because if the desirability and necessity of arranging the content of each subject so that it is func-

tional for the learner—that is, useful in and related to his living and growing—is admitted, then it can hardly be denied that the whole curriculum ought to be functionally organized. Such an admission automatically precludes the use of conventional subjects as well as their logical arrangement of content and admits the necessity of “more fundamental” categories. If the need for other categories—more fundamental with reference to the functions of the school—is admitted, then by the same logic the content of each division (subject) under each category should be selected and organized to be maximally functional and the curriculum and all its parts will thus be consistently focused upon the task of achieving the accepted functions of the school.

Conventional-subject advocates, however, commonly accept as their criterion for the selection and arrangement of content the logical and orderly coverage of the subject. This is not necessarily—in fact, is not likely to be—a good order for accomplishing the learnings required by the functions of the school. Actually, the typical content-arrangement of a conventional subject is often a poor order for learning, even if knowledge of subject-matter were accepted as the criterion, because it was instituted before the laws of learning were identified, and never did and does not now represent a sound effort to promote learning. This conventional order and arrangement is, therefore, psychologically weak even if subject-matter learning were accepted as the criterion. It cannot, therefore, be expected to be defensible as the best arrangement of content for the accomplishment of the proposed functions of the school.

In general, then, this Committee holds that the first step toward a curriculum, sound because it promotes rapid and effective learning, is the acceptance of “more fundamental” categories as defined herein. The second step is the organization and selection, for each such category of content, of experiences which are pregnant with the kind of learnings needed to produce the kinds of growth required by the functions of the school.

It is, therefore, the opinion of this Committee, that, if the school curriculum is to become an effective agency for achieving appropriate functions in a school operating under the “investment theory,” the conventional-subject organization of the curriculum will have to be abandoned in favor of the categories which are more fundamental to the task imposed upon the school by these functions.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE CURRICULUM INVOLVING "MORE FUNDAMENTAL" CATEGORIES

The General Outlines of a Plan. The argument in support of "more fundamental" curricular categories demands the reorganization of both the form and content of the curriculum in harmony with the proposed functions of the secondary school and consistent with present-day psychology. The proposed functions of the secondary school derive from the "Golden Rules" and the "investment theory" of Briggs. Interpreted by this Committee and applied to the sort of social order which it conceives to be desirable in America, these statements require that the schools and all other educative agencies in a society have the double function, first, of developing ability and creating the will in each person so to organize and maintain human relationships that maximum opportunity for growth, development, and well-being can and will be available for all, and second, of creating and developing the ability to use and manage the natural resources of society's physical environment so that they will contribute maximally to the growth, development, and welfare of all. We have shown that effective education in any society is a plan of growth, control, modification, and stimulation along directions approved by that society and that this process results in most growth in power to think, feel, and act when it is sought through a planned program of experiences which appeal to the learner as important to the present and immediate future welfare and well-being of himself and others for whom he is concerned. The problem of the curriculum then becomes one of arranging such experiences as are or can be made meaningful to the learners and which in the experience of the educators in such a society are provocative of maximum amounts of growth in power to think, feel, and act in the life situations which eventuate when this social philosophy begins to act on the physical environment.

This leads to the inevitable conclusion that the curriculum has two major concerns which give rise to two major categories under which its content should be organized. *The first of these should be devoted to society's need for the growth of ability and willingness to sustain and improve the mutually helpful relationships with other human beings which a democratic philosophy of life assumes should characterize group living.* School experiences should, therefore, include a group

dealing with this major social need. These should provide for study of, observation of, and practice in sustaining and improving social relationships. This is the first major category under which school experiences must be classified if the schools' function is purposefully and systematically attained. There are many fields of competence under this major head, each representing a kind of growth needed if competence in solving the problems underlying the major social problem represented by this category is to be secured. Ethics, for instance, is involved here, as no plan for human relationships can be set up except in reference to an ethical criterion.

The second major category should include those experiences concerned with supplying society's need for the growth of ability so to manage and utilize the potentialities of our natural physical environment that it may make its maximum contribution toward the attainment of the high levels of human living which a democratic society seeks for all. School experiences should include a group dealing with this major need. There should be study, observation, exploration, and experimentation in the use of our physical and biological universe for the promotion of human welfare. Here, also, there are fields of competence, each representing a kind of growth needed if competence in solving the problems underlying the second major category is to be secured.²

Society's need, then, for competence in meeting the problems and situations inherent in the improvement of human relationships and in the proper use of the physical environment indicate these two major fundamental categories under which school experiences should be classified if the "investment theory" is applied to the educational program. These major areas should then be sub-divided into smaller areas each of which represents a field of competence needed by some or all citizens. Each field of competence should represent a certain kind of growth essential to the accomplishment of the purposes of the major category under which it falls. Each of these fields of competence should consist of several sets of experiences called hereafter contributory units which in the experience of educators are known or are believed to produce—when directed by a teacher with a clear notion of their purpose but, in a degree, admittedly varying with the interests

²Some fields of competence can be thought of as belonging under both the first and second categories. Any truly fundamental categories (as here defined) will be so interrelated that this will inevitably happen, although usually in such fields one or the other major category is predominantly involved. If this is not evident, it makes little difference under which category the field of competence is treated.

and ability of each learner—the kind of growth sought for under this particular field of competence. Each of these contributory units should be composed of a series of smaller related experiences after the manner of life, for example, the learning of how to drive a car or the learning of how to administer first aid to the injured. One or more related contributory units may be thought of as occupying the place in the curriculum now occupied by subjects—auto-mechanics or hygiene to continue the use of these two examples. Each contributory unit or each related set of them would emphasize a kind of experience, which, in turn, may be broken down into unit-experiences such as learning to shift gears or learning the use of a pulmotor. Such unit-experiences when properly selected are the basic units of socially desirable kinds of growth, of learning, and of living in that society. Therefore, they are the basic elements of a functional curriculum. To repeat, but this time going from the particular to the general, several unit-experiences comprise a contributory unit; several of these units comprise a field of competence, and several fields of competence constitute one of the two major curricular categories. Each major category, as pointed out above, seeks, in turn, to meet one of the broad basic needs of society for a kind of growth in individuals which this Committee holds to be fundamental if a democratic society is to preserve and protect itself and to become “a better place in which to live and in which to make a living.”³

³It is not the function of a chapter devoted to an exposition of the principles which should underlie the organization of the curriculum to outline its content in detail. This will be undertaken elsewhere. The following suggestion of detail is included here, however, to clarify by example the foregoing paragraphs. See, also, the next section of this chapter.

First Major Category should be devoted to supplying society's need for the growth of ability and willingness to sustain and improve the mutually helpful relationships with other human beings which a democratic philosophy of life assumes should characterize group living:

FIELDS OF COMPETENCE

- A. *Physical and Mental Health*—as needed in order to do one's share of the world's work and to prevent interference with ability of others to carry on their share of it.

NOTE: “A” represents a kind of competence individuals must have if the purpose of this major category is to be achieved by the school. Other examples, each of which would require its statement of purpose and its contributory units are: (B) International and Racial Understanding, (C) Education in a Democracy, (D) Speech—Correction and Improvement, and so on.

CONTRIBUTORY UNITS

1. How the food we eat contributes to our health, strength, and appearance.
2. A survey of health and safety conditions in this community and recommendations for their improvement.

NOTE: These two represent types of activities or studies which with others added as needed would contribute to “A” above.

Second Major Category should include those experiences concerned with supplying society's need for the growth of ability so to manage and utilize the potentialities of our natural physical environment that it may make its maximum contribution toward the attainment of the high levels of human living which a democratic society seeks for all:

FIELDS OF COMPETENCE

- A. *Nature and Food*—as needed to produce more and better food.

NOTE: “A” again represents a basic competence which all must have, understand, or appreciate if the purpose of the second category is to be achieved by the school. Other different examples, each of which needs a statement of purpose and its contributory

(Footnote continued on bottom of page 283)

These two major categories constitute the two main strands of the curriculum. Being derived from life itself, which is a related whole, they are not separate and distinct from each other like the small wires in a steel cable. Instead, they and their minor categories are entwined with one another because they are interrelated and inter-acting. They, with their minor categories, form a curriculum for the secondary school which cannot legitimately be described as a "rope of sand," as Learned in a Carnegie Report once described the present curriculum of departments, subjects, and courses.⁴ Since these two are fundamental categories (that is, essential to the welfare of this democratic society) all of the desirable kinds of growth which it is possible for any individual student to make, must be made by all. This means that many of the minor categories will be "constant" for all, with such elective content provided as, because of individual differences in ability and interests, is required to produce the maximum amounts of the desired kinds of growth in each of the different individuals. The opportunity for this desirable differentiation of education and for vocational education will be provided by elective minor categories and sets of experience. Those based upon the most commonly important social needs, problems, and situations will be a part of every youth's education. Many others will be included or excluded from the educational program of each youth according to a variety of factors—local conditions, geographical considerations, social or industrial conditions and needs, personal or family needs, or individual abilities, interests, and previous achievements. The decision will be made on the basis of social value and significance.

This does not involve a disregard of the "rights" of individuals, for a democratic society (always seeking better levels of living for all) desires full development of all youth's special capacities of any social promise, as this is the basis of progress which in a democratic society is movement in the direction of better living for all. Without specialized education, this movement is prevented or impeded and the society's purposes

units are: (B) Inventions, Power Machinery, and Progress, (C) Water Power—Its Use and Management, (4) Electricity and Its Powers, and so on.

CONTRIBUTORY UNITS

1. How do plants grow and reproduce themselves?
2. How has man changed and how can he change the quality and quantity of nature's products?
3. Can man and nature produce enough food for all?

NOTE: These three represent types of activities or studies which with others added as needed would contribute to "A" above.

⁴W. S. Learned: *The Quality of the Educational Process in the United States and Europe*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin, 1927, No. 20.

thwarted. Specialized education is, also, necessary to maintain levels of progress once they are attained. Therefore, for social reasons (not for the satisfaction of anyone's personal desires) differentiated education is provided by society and the limit on the amount and kind of differentiated educations is determined by society and its needs, not by the individual. This justification of specialized education upon a social basis instead of upon an individualistic basis as now and in the past, need raise no fear that individuals will be deprived of the opportunities for educations in keeping with their interests and abilities. Instead, an intelligent society really committed to a democratic philosophy would continually survey its human resources seeking out far more earnestly than now individuals with interests, abilities, and capacities which through further specialized education, whether vocational, technical, or cultural, could be made more effective instrumentalities for the promotion of human welfare and social progress. Only those with a desire to put their abilities to unsocial use (we call it a "vicious" tendency) have any reason to fear loss of individual opportunity for self-development under the "investment theory" of public education.

Therefore, wherever society has a need to be met better, a problem to be solved, or a condition to be improved, involving special abilities to a degree not possessed by all youth, it would set up as a minor category school experiences calculated to develop these abilities. It would then select on the basis of ability and interest or purposes promising youth to whom these special school experiences would be made available. All opportunity for any individual to get relatively insignificant social education should be at private expense and in other institutions than the public school, at least until such time as there are adequate funds with which to provide for all more socially important education.

Specialized education and vocational education under such a plan would not be the lot of a fortunate minority, for every youth has abilities and capacities which through education come to have a greater economic and social value to him and to society than without it. Society needs, therefore, to provide some kind and degree of specialized education for all, for if society *needs* doctors and auto-mechanics, for instance, in the proportion of one to one hundred, then it is important to provide for the necessary amount of specialized education and in the right ratio. This concept of the place of specialized edu-

cation in the total educational program involves, of course, a personal appraisal of the interests, abilities, and capacities of individual youths and an adequate guidance program based thereon, beyond present levels of practice and perhaps of knowledge, for a realization by society of anything like the full value of specialized education under the present program of education as well as under the proposed one awaits the development of adequate guidance and appraisal technique.

Such a curriculum organization involving major categories fundamental to the functions of the school with sound minor categories focused directly upon the task of producing, modifying, or accelerating certain socially desirable kinds of growth by methods defensible in the light of psychology, would present a vastly more effective instrument for achieving the declared functions of the secondary school than a curriculum dependent upon conventional subjects as categories can ever present. It provides better than the latter plan through its major categories for whatever amount and degree of integrative education the society may desire. Through the minor categories it can also make better provision for specialized vocational or cultural education for the later years of the secondary school than can ever be done when the program has to be cast in the fixed molds of conventional subjects.

A Plan for Moving Toward a Curriculum Incorporating "More Fundamental" Categories. There are doubtless many ways of beginning the task of shifting from the present conventional curricular organization to one such as is proposed by the second alternative in this issue. In presenting a plan for doing so, this Committee does not argue that it is the *one* superior way of accomplishing this result. However, to offset any contention that such a shift is impossible, it presents the following plan for making the transition, but specifically asserts that other good or better plans could doubtless be formulated and that varying local conditions would require many modifications in any general plan offered by anyone.

1. Accept as fundamental to all planning for public education the "investment theory" and test all proposals against it.
2. Accept the two major functions for secondary education in America as stated herein or formulate other more acceptable ones.
3. Set up these major categories and evaluate the organization and content of the curriculum in terms of their probable

success in contributing to the achievement of the educational purposes underlying them.

4. Accept as psychologically sound the interrelatedness of living, learning, and growing, and plan the content of the curriculum, the methods of teaching, and the total experience involved in attending the school with full recognition of this condition in mind. (See the Committee's deductions on page 265.)

5. Consider the following suggestion for daily program for a Junior school (Grades 7, 8, 9, 10) and a Senior school (Grades 11, 12, 13, 14) and begin to bring the present thought and practice in schedule and program making into line with this one or another better one if and as proposed.

Table I

Grades 7, 8, 9, 10

Program- Units	Min- utes	Activity	Percent
2	60	Social Studies and Activities (including English)	18
2	60	Science (including Health)	18
2	60	Service Courses	18
2	60	Play	18
3	90	Exploratory Opportunity for Special- Ability Discovery and Development...	27
11	330 net (6 hours gross)		99

Grades 11, 12, 13, 14

2	60	Social Studies (including English)	15
1	30 (or less)	Service Courses	8
2	60	Play, Health, and Physical Recreation	15
4	120 (or more)	Major Interest	30
4	120 (or less)	Minor Interest	30
13	420 net (7 hours gross)		98

Note 1. The Human Relationship core is the first major category. It includes the use of much of the content now thought of as English, Social studies, Play and Health. It should contain the integrating social experience which should be common to all. Further (specialized) education in these areas for those interested and able is available in the upper years, especially, as a major or minor interest program. (See Note 5 be-

low.) Minor categories (each with its sets of unit-experiences as suggested on pages 281-282) will provide the details of this core.

Note 2. The Service Courses area is in reality an upward extension of the elementary-school curriculum to meet special individual deficiencies. This is patterned on present college practice of carrying elements of secondary education even into graduate schools to meet "shortages" with which some students are still struggling. It is not an inherent part of the secondary-school program as herein proposed but is included to meet an existing situation rising out of deficiencies in previous educational opportunities or the presence of personal physical handicaps. At present, it should involve a practice opportunity for those who needed better command of fundamental processes of mathematics, English composition, spelling, handwriting or typewriting, speech, reading, and corrective physical and health education.

Note 3. The Use and Management of Society's Environment (shown on diagram as Science, for brevity) is the second major category. It should incorporate the experience with the environment considered essential for all to have. Due to the limitations of graphic representation it appears to come to an end at the close of the 10th year. It must be remembered, however, that its study would be continued by many either as a major or minor interest. (See Note 5 below.) Minor categories should be developed as suggested on pages 281-282.

Note 4. The Special Ability and Exploratory Opportunity provision permits beginning of differentiation essential to discovery and development of major interests and abilities. This, however, is not extra-curricular in any sense, as no socially justifiable school experience *can* fall wholly outside of the activities involved in the two major categories (cores), for everything grows out of experience with the social, biological, or physical environment. This provision simply amplifies the opportunity for further differentiation provided for by the minor categories falling under each major one.

Note 5. The Major Interests program of each student also *must* be an elaboration of some elements of the two cores for the same reasons. In this major interest sector, extra time is spent on human relationships problems, or science is continued for some students though not as a constant. For some students, this area represents (at first) pre-vocational or pre-professional (now called college-preparatory) experiences and in the later years vocational and professional education. It must be based upon discovered interests (purposes) and abilities of the learner potentially most profitable to society and satisfactory to the individual. Hence an appraisal and guidance service is an essential feature of school administration.

Note 6. The provision for Minor Interests is avocational and recreational in nature. Recreation on the diagram is meant to imply chiefly physical recreation. Minor interests include mental and social recreation, and activities usually called "hobbies." The cultural advance depends upon the number and variety of interests. This is true for a society as well as for an individual so this is a justifiable expense for society to incur.

6. Consider the present school program. Decide to which category (if to any) each element of it should be assigned and how it would have to be modified, reorganized, and supplemented better to serve the purposes of the proposed secondary school.

7. Set up a plan for systematically making such modifications, reorganizations, and supplementations and inventions as would bring each element of the school's program and activities more into harmony with the functions to be performed by the curricular category to which it has been assigned (in 6 above). Holding the first four of the above proposals in mind, continue to select and organize activities and content more effectively to get the results demanded by these proposals until conventional-subject organization has been abandoned wherever and to whatever degree experience determines to be desirable when the proposed functions of the secondary school are honestly and intelligently sought.

8. As this content and these activities are selected and instituted, begin to bring together under minor categories those sets of experiences that should be included to produce common or similar types of growth in various types of youth. Arrange these sets of experiences and the unit-experiences in each set into a good order for producing this growth. Many of these sets will, of course, involve growth along several socially desirable lines rather than along one alone. If the experiences are really like those of life, this is inevitable. Assign such to the minor category concerned with the production of the kind of growth with which they are chiefly concerned. When this is impossible to decide because two or more kinds of growth are so closely intertwined, assignment to one of several minor categories will be satisfactory. Continue until all of the school's program is recognized as belonging chiefly to one of the minor categories.

9. Check over the minor categories under each major one to see if all the recognizably important kinds of growth needed to serve the school's major functions are provided for. If not, add others and provide appropriate sets of experience. Check over the experience provided under all minor categories to decide whether a desirable amount of the best kind of experience (content) is provided under each. Change this content (that is, reconstruct the curriculum) from time to time and place to place as developments and changes both within

and without the school make such changes possible and essential to the effective accomplishment of the school's functions.

10. Consider casting these revisions into the form of pamphlets (study-activity or work-guides) to be provided each pupil for each "set of experiences" under each minor category. These should be thought of as suggesting several possible ways by which an individual or a large or small group may proceed to carry out experiences by which the accepted purposes in terms of desirable growth may be achieved. Properly designed, such guides have the possibility of individualizing class procedures, meeting wide ranges in ability and interests, and of broadening the curriculum which can be economically provided in small high schools. These small high schools, because of their number, and because of the difficulties involved, demand special consideration when proposing curricular reorganization. It is, however, not admitted that the acid test of a curricular plan is its overcoming of all the shortcomings of the small high school. Neither can it be expected to overcome the conservatism of rural areas which now prevents many administrators and teachers in small schools from introducing newer educational practices. Some of these are inherent in smallness and should be overcome by consolidation as improved transportation facilities and highways permit. Others, where these are impossible, will have to be met by recognizing the need for higher per capita costs in such schools and the consequent necessity for weighted distribution of state and federal funds in their favor where there is no other way to provide adequate educational opportunity. A sound curricular proposal must not, however, complicate the small school's curricular problems. The proposal for curricular organization submitted here, in some respects is much simpler than the traditional one which small schools are now attempting to imitate. It involves the reorganization of content so that a larger percentage of students' time may legitimately be spent on constants, thus preventing the necessity for so many electives and reducing the necessity for so many "curricula." The fusing of content under the two cores with the consequent elimination of the need for the teaching of so many separate subjects, also, is a move in the direction of simplification. Small schools now, the community being willing, could more easily begin consolidating content under these two cores than can many large schools where excessive departmentalization has made deep inroads. Such schools as have vocational, agricultural, or home-making

courses commonly have a close relation to the life of the community which makes progress toward evaluating content on the basis suggested herein easy. Many vocational teachers of agriculture in small schools are also setting other teachers in America excellent examples of functional organization of materials of instruction and are bringing together, through use, content drawn from other courses and fusing the whole of school experience with life out of schools, as few teachers in large schools ever do. Small schools, if given support, help, and encouragement of the State department and neighboring colleges, will find ways at hand to move readily toward the type of curricular organization suggested here.

V. THE COMMITTEE'S CONCLUSION

In the light of what this Committee considers to be sound educational philosophy applicable to the problem of creating a desirable educational program in our American democracy and on the basis of what experimental psychology has contributed to knowledge of educational methods and procedures, this Committee does not believe that a curriculum utilizing conventional subjects as the categories under which school experiences are organized, presents a defensible method of procedure. It, therefore, adheres to the second alternative supporting categories which are more fundamental because inherently involved and directly concerned with the proposed functions of American secondary schools and because more in harmony with the demands of present-day psychology of learning.

This Committee, therefore, holds that some plan of the general character outlined herein should be developed by which to accomplish the shift from present conventional-subject categories to proposed "more fundamental" ones. It can be instituted on a local, state, regional, or national basis as may seem practicable, but this Committee is on record elsewhere (See Issue I, p. 77) as favoring the larger unit of organization for curriculum reconstruction rather than the smaller one. As Dewey has pointed out on his page in the May, 1935, issue of *The Social Frontier*, there is a difference between a national and a "nationalistic" program of education. This Committee holds that a national program of education which is neither nationalistic nor *localistic* is needed in America. However, until effective large-unit organizations for curriculum recon-

struction are instituted, such a plan as set out above will be useful in redesigning local and state curricular programs and if widely used will tend to give a needed unity of thinking and effort to present curriculum reconstruction on the local and state basis. The committee's position is not that this plan must be adopted, but that an intelligent effort to develop and gain general acceptance of a plan for effectively instituting a shift from conventional-subject categories to "more fundamental" ones, is an important social responsibility of the teaching profession in this country.

ISSUE VIII

Shall secondary education present merely organized knowledge, or shall it also assume responsibility for attitudes and ideals?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

This issue assumes great importance from the very fact that a pupil's experience in school will surely affect his attitudes and ideals whether the school accepts any responsibility for them or not. One's attitudes and ideals are affected by his every experience, in school and out; to live means to form them. Consequently, it is perfectly possible that the education boys and girls receive, unless care is taken to prevent it, may develop or confirm undesirable attitudes or ideals, or that the attitudes and ideals formed in school, if happily they are good, may be superseded in real life by less desirable ones taken from such influences as the moving pictures or the press.

A recognition of this possibility is the strongest motive educators have for taking concerted action to develop in boys and girls socially desirable attitudes and ideals that will resist harmful influences and guide them effectively in the co-operative action which the conditions of modern life demand.

If to be well-informed always meant to be good-intentioned, a policy of *laissez-faire* in the development of attitudes and ideals might be justified. Unfortunately there is too much evidence that this is not so. Nor can educators neglect to plan definitely for the development in the secondary schools of desirable attitudes and ideals because they cannot adequately measure the results of their efforts. That is the fault of measurement. Nor is it enough to leave character education to the lower grades, as though the development of character ceases at adolescence. It is not only quickened at that time, but it is then that attitudes and ideals act most effectively to motivate a pupil's actions and learning.

There are obstacles, of course, to carrying out plans to help boys and girls to develop the attitudes and ideals most useful to them. The greatest difficulty is the present uncertainty of educators as to what the most desirable attitudes and ideals are. The attitudes and ideals of the American people,

from whom the schools must ultimately take their cue, are in the process of changing, and educators must turn to frequent restatements of national aims, such as the recent report of the National Educational Association's Committee on the Social-Economic Goals of America. Another obstacle is the persistence in many quarters of the old academic tradition, which places great emphasis upon the presentation of subject-matter and often too little on the attitudes and ideals which subject-matter should serve. The narrow curriculum it offers is for many pupils an insufficient background for the development of attitudes and ideals which will inspire them to better living. Finally, inadequate equipment in materials and personnel imposes a handicap on any program for making effective the work of the school in developing character.

These obstacles can be gradually overcome. The first and by far the most important step that educators can take is to recognize in theory and in practice that secondary education must plan as definitely for the development of desirable attitudes and ideals as for instruction in organized knowledge. Both within and without the school, in the classroom and out of it, there are many opportunities for pupils to participate in activities, beneficial to themselves and to the community, that will lead to the development of the ideals and the attitudes which educators seek.

Pupils must not only enjoy appropriate experiences for the formation of the right attitudes and ideals; they must also have a chance to think about their experiences in a detached and impartial way. The classroom must therefore be a place where pupils may consider intellectually such social and economic questions as they will face as citizens. To deny them this freedom is to shut them off from the real world. They cannot work out useful attitudes and ideals in the dark. Educators must therefore develop a more vital curriculum and place in charge of classrooms teachers of rectitude and sincerity, who have been trained to realize the importance of developing desirable attitudes and ideals in their pupils. In such ways the obstacles to effective character education can be largely overcome. The secondary school will then not only transmit to young people the knowledge that they need for living, but it will also help them to form the attitudes and ideals necessary to make that knowledge effective in service to society.

I. THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

Meaning of Attitude and Ideal. The word *attitude* has gathered so many different connotations that it is necessary first to clarify its meaning for the present discussion. When a teacher says that a pupil's *attitude* is wrong, he may mean merely that some school regulation has no meaning for that student; or he may use the word *attitude* as synonymous with some "virtue" or quality like dependability or diligence; or he may use the word with its ethical connotation and imply that the student's observed conduct to him is not disinterested, enlightened, and valuable for society.

Though psychologists have not come to an agreement on a completely satisfactory definition of attitude, still less upon a generally accepted explanation of how attitudes originate, we shall use the term as equivalent to the phrase devised by the American Psychological Association, "a stabilized set or disposition". "As a result of experiences, sometimes single but usually multiple and complex, that are satisfying or annoying, every one develops a large number of attitudes, all of which are in some degree attended by feeling".¹ Hence the "set" or "disposition" becomes emotionalized. It is to be noted that the emotionalized set or disposition which accompanies experiences may be desirable or the reverse; it may be suffused with ethical or religious feelings or it may be completely uncolored by them.

In this discussion we shall use the word *ideals* to signify those larger wholes, those generalizations conscious or unconscious, into which, on the basis of experiences, an individual's emotionalized attitudes tend to arrange themselves, and which in turn, once present, serve to give significance to attitudes themselves.

The Alternatives Contained in This Issue. The issue poses the question whether secondary education shall confine itself to introducing boys and girls to some portion of the vast store of human knowledge without regard for the attitudes and ideals which result from that process, or whether it shall *plan definitely* to develop those attitudes and ideals which are regarded as desirable. It is obvious that the fund of useful human knowledge can at best be tapped only here and there by education which is adapted to the needs of adolescents. While

¹T. H. Briggs: *Secondary Education*, p. 375. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933.

this fund of knowledge increases with every day, while lack of time is the constant lament of the teacher as he aims to present those portions of it which appear to be of most immediate importance to youth facing the complexities of modern life, shall secondary education plan its procedures for the presentation of this available knowledge for its own inherent values and irrespective of the attitudes which result, or shall these procedures be planned for the object of developing such emotionalized attitudes and ideals as seem desirable?

II. ARGUMENTS FOR THE FIRST ALTERNATIVE

Mention has been made of the increasing amount of sheer knowledge necessary for successful living in present day American life as compared with that of fifty years ago. Efficiency in buying, voting, running machines, choosing a vocation, choosing a mate, and making a living, involves in each case, knowledge of a whole series of facts pertinent to making a wise decision. Those who hold that secondary education has enough to do with the presentation of organized knowledge point on the one hand to the extent of this material which should be mastered, and on the other hand they call attention to the disasters which may result from mere ignorance. It is pointed out that during the last fifty years the development of scientific facts, and the organization of knowledge so gained has produced untold potential good for society, but that the very lack of general acquaintance with available knowledge in the field of the social sciences has led in part at least to the present confusion in and among nations.

It is further argued that if secondary education does not hold itself responsible for presenting organized knowledge alone, irrespective of resultant attitudes and ideals, it is not to be assumed that desirable attitudes and ideals do not accompany the acquisition of that knowledge. Though a fact-to-be-learned may appear to be a matter of intellect purely, an affective concomitant clings to it in the very recognition of it as a fact. "Psychologists maintain that there is an affective concomitant with the recognition of even the most severely intellectual facts, such as the parity of two angles or the specific gravity of lead."² Thus, however factual and "practical" material organized for purposes of teaching and learning may be, during the process of teaching and learning it cannot escape

²T. H. Briggs: *op. cit.*, p. 371.

coloration or refraction from the mental and emotional reactions of teacher and learner; while they, in turn, from the many concomitant learnings associated with the activity in the foreground, are building up individually an assent or dissent, an eagerness, reluctance or indifference, a warmth or coldness which we call an attitude. In the presentation of organized knowledge, therefore, cultured, sympathetic, and enthusiastic teachers may induce desirable attitudes and ideals no matter what they are teaching. Common evidence of personal experience is adduced to the effect that a student "got more" from a teacher of mathematics, geology, or English grammar, than from all teachers who were concerned directly with aesthetics, ethics, or religion.

The further argument has been advanced that if definite planning for the development of desirable attitudes is to be a recognized function of education, that function should be centered in the primary grades rather than in the secondary school. Undesirable attitudes observed in the secondary school are often nothing but undesirable habits acquired before the fifth grade. "It is unfortunate that for most parents and teachers conduct-education is a matter of remediation. Conduct is not given attention until it annoys".³ "Such consistency of character as pupils have achieved is the product of experience *preceding* the fifth grade in school, and does not materially increase as they move up through the eighth"⁴ Hence, desirable attitudes in secondary-school pupils are best developed through definite planning in the primary grades.

It is urged further that it is futile for secondary education to plan definitely to develop desirable attitudes and ideals in students unless colleges and training schools have previously planned definitely to develop desirable attitudes and ideals in secondary-school teachers. The creative influence of the ideals and attitudes of the teacher is universally admitted. To be sure, the personality of a candidate for a teaching position is one of the considerations which determines appointment, but the plans and programs of teachers' colleges are directed in the main toward the teaching of technical courses in education and courses designed for the mastery of certain fields or organized knowledge, rather than for the cultivation of desirable attitudes and ideals. It is argued that definite planning for these purposes in secondary education is somewhat illogical

³P. M. Symonds: *The Nature of Conduct*, p. 323. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928.

⁴H. Hartshorne, M. A. May, and F. K. Shuttlesworth: *Studies in the Nature of Character*, Vol. III, p. 376. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.

unless and until the same definite planning has been perfected in teacher-training institutions.

It is argued finally that secondary education ought not to plan definitely for the accomplishment of something unless it possesses the means of determining whether accomplishment toward the goal set is real or imaginary. Careful studies indicate that the reliability of teachers' judgments of student character traits is very low.⁵ Secondary schools have at hand various means more or less reliable for determining how far pupils are acquiring organized knowledge, but how is the secondary school to know whether or not the student is developing desirable attitudes and ideals? The Tenth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence, devoted to character education, concludes with three paragraphs on the outlook for measurement of character in which the following sentences occur:

The final word of this chapter may fittingly be one of skepticism. There is no good reason for expecting tests of persons to yield the constant results found in physical measures. Exactly the same situation can never recur and can never be presented in two different persons. We deal in human life with a series of events having common elements but always distinguished by unique features and having thus unique totalities. The attempt to measure one trait after another, eventually, to be summed into a total character, is doomed.⁶

III. ARGUMENTS FOR THE SECOND ALTERNATIVE

Bearing of Other Issues on the Resolution of Issue VIII.

We must approach the resolution of this issue in the light of the resolutions of the other issues considered in the present volume. Pertinent to the selection of the alternative here to be preferred is the principle of social return discussed in Issue III; the principle of diversified offerings rather than a common curriculum elaborated in Issue IV; the principle that fundamental areas of interests such as leisure, health, citizenship, etc., should be accepted by secondary education for the classification of school experience, rather than the conventional school subjects, (Issue VII); and particularly the conception elaborated in Issue IX that the school should provide a social milieu in which the activities, beliefs, and attitudes of a changing and evolving democracy may be reflected in little.

⁵T. L. Kelley and A. C. Krey: *Tests and Measurements in the Social Sciences*, pp. 434-5. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

⁶*Character Education*, The Department of Superintendence, Tenth Yearbook, Department of Superintendence, N. E. A. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1932.

All of these point to a dynamic and directive element in secondary education which transcends the mere presentation of organized knowledge. But the first alternative in this issue entails to some degree at least a prejudgment about what is to be taught, inconsistent with diversified offerings. It points to the conventional curriculum of certain school subjects, in which for purposes of instruction knowledge has been hitherto best organized. It assumes that boys and girls can best develop into socially profitable citizens in a changing democracy through the acquisition of organized knowledge irrespective of attitudes resulting. Thus quite apart from the arguments which follow, the first alternative is inconsistent with the resolution of other issues discussed in the present volume.

Relation of Knowledge to Attitude. It is true that knowledge is power—when it is set to work; it is true that, when not completely emotionalized, attitudes may be modified by knowledge. There is evidence to support the opinion that when students discuss earnestly and thoughtfully the bases of their social beliefs and attitudes in the light of pertinent facts, those beliefs and attitudes become more consistent and enlightened.⁷ Indeed educators are becoming increasingly conscious that students do not proceed far in acquiring organized knowledge without attitudes favorable to the process of acquisition. Professor Crawford sums up the survey of student opinion at Yale in the conclusion that “purpose, appreciable by the student, strongly influences his academic motivation and thereby his accomplishment”.⁸ In evaluating candidates for admission, colleges increasingly tend to go back of the record of the grades by which achievement in organized knowledge is measured, and ask what is this person like; what are his motives, what are his attitudes?⁹

But it is quite another thing to act on the belief that a knowledge of facts or the mastery of organized knowledge will of itself insure desirable behavior whether in the realm of personal character or of social justice. It seems to be fairly well established that there exists no definite relationship between conduct and ideas about conduct, between specific items of information and specific exhibitions of behavior in the case of children below the eighth grade.¹⁰ Furthermore, the persons

⁷M. H. Harper: *Social Beliefs and Attitudes of American Educators*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.

⁸A. B. Crawford: *Incentives to Study*, p. 117. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929.

⁹See the discussion in Issue VI, pp. 251.

¹⁰H. Hartshorne, M. A. May, and F. K. Shuttlesworth: *Studies in the Nature of Character*, Vol. VIII, p. 165. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.

or groups of persons who in the past few years have most strenuously opposed efforts to ameliorate social inequalities and injustices have not been characterized by ignorance of the pertinent facts.

Relation of Attitudes to Nature and Needs of the Child.

Investigators and students of child nature seem to agree that the basis of desirable attitudes is to be sought in the habits which children acquire in early childhood. But as the infant grows up through childhood to adolescence, potential emotional trends and typical behavior in which these trends manifest themselves occur all along the way. These are the stuff with which education has to deal; educational techniques must take cognizance of these emotional changes normal with the growing child and provide fit environment for their expression. One of the emotional trends characteristic of adolescence is the desire to grow up and establish oneself as an independent adult, and the contrary desire to retain the warm comfort and security of the home. It seems fairly clear that within this ambivalence, within the area affected by these two contrary desires, the teacher may look for the explanation of a wide variety of conduct, normal and abnormal, among adolescents—behavior patterns toward parents, teachers, comrades of both sexes; behavior in respect to the formal duties of educational routine and the varied activities of the school, club, and church. A valid scheme of education for adolescents must be based upon the nature and the needs of adolescents, and must be definitely planned so that youth's normal emotional trends may find desirable expression.

Evaluation of Attitudes. If the importance of attitudes and ideals is recognized, the argument that secondary education ought not to plan for their development on the ground that they are not measurable falls to the ground. The same argument would discountenance the teaching of music and art. All measurement is approximate, and much of what passes for educational measurement grossly inexact. Promising endeavors of many kinds are being made to evaluate attitudes as they express themselves in typical individual behavior. Prominent among these is the systematic recording of notes and anecdotes of observed behavior at the Athenaeum and Mechanics Institute of Rochester, New York. Other schemes devised by individual schools or school systems are described in Mono-

graph No. 13 of the National Survey of Secondary Education.¹¹ Several secondary schools are working experimentally toward the discovery of short-cut methods of evaluating students' attitudes as determined by behavior; for it is obviously anomalous that one of the chief objectives of education should continue indefinitely to be appraised by guesswork.

Again if the importance of attitudes and ideals is recognized it is clearly illogical to rely on their development merely through the processes of instructing students in organized knowledge. To be sure the student's ideas of right and wrong are constantly involved in the judgments he makes in dealing with classroom situations. As Professor Beard has pointed out, "whether it is a matter of accepting past knowledge or of applying knowledge to present or impending social situations, certain ethical and aesthetic considerations are nearly always involved. The individual's ideas of right and wrong, of expediency or in expediency, and his individual likes and dislikes play an important part both in his acceptance of knowledge of the past and his use of knowledge for immediate needs."¹² Since this process is always going on, it is clearly important for those who present organized knowledge to be concerned about *how* it is going on.

Attitudes are developed through all the experiences and activities of the child. This means that all the influences in the school must be in harmony to form a climate or atmosphere favorable to the growth of desirable attitudes. It means also that the school should be aware that it is the only institution left in which the attitudes, beliefs, and ideals of society may be passed on to the next generation. It means also that the school has a function as the center of community life, for the influence of the street, radio, movie, and press upon the growth of attitudes doubtless outweighs the influence of the school itself. In his illuminating analysis of the nature of attitudes and of their place in the scheme of education, Briggs writes: "It would not be far from the truth to say that character is the sum of emotionalized attitudes. To the extent that this is correct, education has in this field an inviting opportunity and a tremendous responsibility".¹³ The full force of this statement is not felt until we reflect upon the power of emotionalized attitudes to shape the conduct of individuals and of groups, and

¹¹Roy O. Billett: *Provision for Individual Differences, Marks, and Promotions*, pp. 444 ff., National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 13, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 17.

¹²See also T. L. Kelley and A. C. Krey: *op. cit.*, p. 473.

¹³T. H. Briggs: *Secondary Education*, p. 379. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933.

to dictate policies national and international; and until we consider further that these powerful agencies affecting the education of youth, such as the press, cinema, and radio, are not primarily concerned that their influence be directed toward building attitudes which are desirable, and against building attitudes which are undesirable. The extent of the responsibility of education for "moral attitudes" has been strikingly emphasized in the last few years by the disasters which result when they cease to be operative in the conduct of business and politics. These disasters were not due to lack of knowledge but to the lack of the sum total of desirable attitudes known as character. Thus the secondary school is directly concerned that its own influence shall conduce to the growth of desirable attitudes in its students, and further, the supervisors and officers of secondary education have a peculiar interest that all other institutions which affect the development of attitudes in adolescent youth shall exercise that influence for the establishment of desirable rather than undesirable attitudes.

Indeed the school administrator has but to look about him to realize what a high price is placed by "practical" men, propagandists, and interests on the make, upon attitudes as the means of reaching their objectives. Wars are waged, cigarettes sold, candidates elected to office, poppies and white carnations worn on special days, through the manufacture of appropriate attitudes in each case. The secondary-school principal's official life itself depends on an attitude of the public mind hitherto favorable to equal educational opportunities for all adolescents.

Definite Planning for Attitudes Peculiarly Needed To-day.

Discussion of previous issues has repeatedly emphasized the rapid economic and social changes observable in our culture and has noted their consequences upon educational theory and practice. The treatment of Issue III has already traced the effect of economic individualism and independence upon the development of education and has called attention to the inevitable tendency toward greater coöperation and collectivism.¹⁴

These considerations have peculiar bearing upon the present issue, because pioneer attitudes tend to outlive pioneering opportunities. Ideals of mastery, dominance, and personal success without regard for others survive after the conditions which nourished them have passed away. Similar residues persist in our ideals in regard to such passive virtues as pa-

¹⁴Issue III, pp. 132-139.

tience and long-suffering, which one flourished within the shadows of the church. Professor Truman L. Kelley studied the ratings which teachers and fellow-students assigned to pupils in the following eight so-called traits: Courtesy, Fair Play, Honesty, Loyalty, Mastery, Poise, Respect for Property Rights, School Drive. It is significant that statistical study of the ratings shows that several of these traits are the same; that they boil down to two; and that both of these residua are survivals from a past age.

In summing up the study, Kelley writes: "Two or three independent character trait measures are highly successful in giving the gist of the complex story told by as many as eight trait measures chosen originally because of their separate importance in connection with school situations. The first of these measures is Puritania (a coined term) and the second is Rugged Individualism."¹⁵

Schools have clearly to shoulder their part of the responsibility to interpret the American tradition of rugged individualism in terms of social consequences and social obligations. "The majority age among criminals has moved steadily downward until the peak of serious arrests is now at nineteen years. It costs a community no more to train a good citizen than to train a 'good' gangster. At the end of this training the gangster is a heavy drain on the community. It costs society \$300 a year to maintain an adult prisoner in an institution, \$400 for a juvenile delinquent. The good citizen at the end of his training begins to support the community and contributes to its resources. The cost of keeping a youth in school averages \$100 a year."¹⁶

Planning definitely for desired attitudes and ideals means devising experiences and situations in secondary schools through which those attitudes will be developed which will aid and not hinder the welfare and progress of society.

IV. OBSTACLES TO THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Uncertainty as to Desired Attitudes and Ideals. Prominent among the impediments which obstruct the actual practice of the second alternative of this issue is uncertainty in regard to what are "desired attitudes and ideals". It is pertinent to ask what are the ideals of the United States which

¹⁵T. L. Kelley and A. C. Krey: *op. cit.*, p. 434.

¹⁶*How Can Communities Help? With Accounts of What Some Communities are Doing.* Washington, D. C.: United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, September, 1935. (Mimeographed.)

shall be proclaimed as goals and aimed at through the establishment in the young of attitudes related to them. What do we as a nation hold at the present time to be our ideals in regard to democratic government, to industry, to religion, to sport, to sex morality, to education itself? Compared with other nations we are singularly devoid of agreement as to definite and generally accepted ideals and goals; and amid the confusion of voices the youth emerging from school or college with the desire to live the good and useful life finds himself baffled both by the absence of opportunities to live it, and the sense of uncertainty as to what it is and whether it really exists. The full functioning of the school as a builder of those attitudes and ideals which shall be beneficial to society presupposes that school and society shall be in broad agreement about what attitudes and ideals are desirable. The efforts of secondary education to build up desirable attitudes in the young must in many cases be thwarted if youth leave our schools conditioned to a society of coöperation, altruism, and concern for the interests of the group, only to enter a society organized on the principle of competition and the exploitation of the weak.

It might be comforting to some minds to have the ideals of the United States put into words and carved in stone. But that is impossible, for ideals evolve progressively with the experiences which create them. Ideals of coöperation result from experiences in coöperation, whether those experiences are confined to a school or national in their scope. Hence the ideals of our democracy must be restated continuously, to accord with the constant efforts and experiences of society toward better communal living. Such a restatement has been recently made by a committee appointed by the National Education Association, and is condensed and paraphrased in the discussion of Issue I.¹⁷ Here is a statement which can be worked over by any school authority wherever situated with the purpose of translating it into school experiences from which attitudes favorable to the attainment of the goals stated may spring.

Within such a framework attitudes and ideals will be interpreted or emphasized in accordance with prevailing sentiment in the supporting community. The attitudes and ideals held to be desirable in a village community in Connecticut will be different from those desired in a mining town of West Virginia, and different again from those of a community in Missis-

¹⁷See Issue No. I, pp. 50-51.

sippi. These desired attitudes and ideals may vary widely. The usefulness of such statements as the one just mentioned, prepared at intervals by qualified groups representative of American education is that in them schools and school boards may find guide lines by which the desirability of proposed attitudes and ideals may be appraised.

It is then no sufficient objection to the preferred alternative to say that universal agreement cannot be reached as to what attitudes and ideals are desirable. The function of the school in every locality is to exert its influence that attitudes and ideals shall be in fact desirable from the point of view of the common good; and, these once agreed upon, to unite school and community in the common effort to provide situations favorable for their development.

Persistence of the Academic Tradition. Another obstacle is the persistence of the academic tradition in our secondary schools to the neglect of fundamental interests of the individual student. This has already been discussed in a previous issue.¹⁸ The attitudes of a student toward his own education are so obviously connected with the degree to which experiences are meaningful and related to his interests that this subject need not be further elaborated here. Allied to it, however, is the assumption sometimes made by teachers that their function as instructors has nothing to do with the establishment of attitudes and ideals, which are to be relegated to persons and groups interested in "moral education"; whereas attitudes desirable or the reverse are being established at every moment of the process of instruction, and "moral education" as a thing distinct and separate has proved to be a negligible factor in the establishment of attitudes and ideals in so far as these are reflected in behavior.

Insufficient Equipment in Materials and Personnel. Another serious obstacle is the insufficient equipment of secondary schools in some parts of the country in material and personnel. Club rooms, playing fields, libraries, adequate provision for health and recreation services are obviously necessary if schools are to discharge this function with effectiveness. Nor can this be done when teachers are overloaded and classes too large.

Again evidence abounds that if secondary education is to be successful in developing desirable attitudes in students it

¹⁸See Issue VI.

must be strong enough to resist the counter-influences of organized pressure groups not primarily concerned or interested in educational values. Such interference is increasing, and possibly cannot be successfully combatted without a united front from organized teachers and educators.

The negative argument, strongly urged in some quarters, that it is idle for secondary education to undertake a task which secondary-school teachers are not trained to execute has been noted in the second section of this discussion. Though civics has been regularly taught in secondary schools for years, the attitudes which it was hoped would result when the subject was introduced have not appeared. In commenting upon the studies of attitudes, opinions, and prejudices, the Tenth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence concludes that "evidence that schools build attitudes of constructive citizenship is, so far, not very impressive".¹⁰ Some of the reasons for this disappointing result have been mentioned above. But no amount of equipment either in material or men will suffice, if in the training of teachers this objective of secondary education is not emphasized and prepared for.

V. WHAT CAN BE DONE

The purpose of the following paragraphs is to suggest various steps that can be taken under conditions as they are. Some progressive schools will find them repetitions of an old story; others will declare them inapplicable to their own conditions. Much can be done, however, toward planning definitely to develop desired attitudes and ideals *without additional expense* if the *attitude of the school* itself is one of readiness, sympathy, and alert inquiry into ways and means by which it may perform this important function.

1. *Administrators should recognize both in theory and in practice that secondary education must plan as definitely for the development of desired attitudes and ideals as for instruction in organized knowledge.*

When administrators are "attitude conscious," teachers tend to become so.

2. *Within the school, experiences and activities can be provided from which attitudes and ideals basic for intelligent*

¹⁰Character Education, p. 140. The Department of Superintendence, Tenth Yearbook. Department of Superintendence, N. E. A. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1932.

participation in a changing democracy may be expected to develop.

A pupil may begin to participate in planning his own education if, in his classroom, recitations are socialized; he may participate in self-government if the group is self-directed under guidance, if the care and cleanliness of the room, its decoration, and the custody of the materials it contains are made matters of group concern and responsibility. Progressively by means of a school council of teachers and students, charged with the making of real decisions and the assumption of real responsibilities, the attitude of good citizenship may be strengthened.

Courses of instruction as a whole, and separate projects which form a part of them must be planned with the definite aim of aiding in the establishment of desirable attitudes. Where the curriculum still consists of the conventional "required" school subjects, resultant attitudes should be observed and recorded, and such modifications introduced as the evidence indicates. Though attitudes depend largely on previously acquired habits, it must be remembered that they are continually being modified by experiences, and new attitudes are originating with every new activity of the curriculum. Hence projects and courses ought to be inaugurated only after deliberate analysis of all the elements involved, and the probable result in terms of student attitudes.

Many courses are so planned. For example the Denver course in the Social Sciences is planned to help the child gain a feeling of responsibility for his associates, a desire to share in the work of the world, an attitude of tolerance, etc.²⁰

Dramatics may be consciously planned with the development of desirable attitudes as one of its purposes. A school library staffed by pupils furnishes an experience in public service. If the school library is a branch of the public library, students are already doing the service of adult citizenship. A school supply room manned by students is another example of opportunity for active experience in coöperation for the common good. A system of intra-school athletics may offer an invaluable opportunity for the growth of attitudes of coöperation and self-control. The full possibilities of the school assembly have been approximated only here and there.²¹ Through the agency of the school assembly group attitudes

²⁰For similar schemes developed by cities and states, see H. Hartshorne, M. A. May, and F. K. Shuttlesworth: *op. cit.*, pp. 80-102.

²¹See *Some Uses of the School Assembly*. New York: The Lincoln School of Teachers College, 1922. Assemblies at the Francis W. Parker School in Chicago have for years been the school's chief instrument for discovering, clarifying, and adopting ideals.

may be formulated and developed, emotions elevated and refined through music and literature shared by the entire group, and loyalties enlarged to include constantly wider areas.

3. *Outside the school, coöperation should be sought with all other agencies interested in the establishment of attitudes and ideals, so that in out-of-school hours students may, wherever possible, have the experience of actual participation in activities beneficial to the community as a whole.*

These agencies are most frequently the home, the church, and the camp or club. Joint discussion in parent-teacher groups is extremely effective in some schools. An illustration of coöperation between school and community is seen in the participation of high school students in the "Let's Quit Killing" campaign organized in the state of Oregon. Attitudes of respect for law and respect for the rights of others are thus induced by activities shared with adults. A widely different example of joint pupil-adult participation in work useful to the community is the contribution of students in the rural schools of Michigan toward controlling the devastations of the tent caterpillar.²²

Out-of-school clubs vary greatly in their influence upon the establishment of desirable attitudes. The contribution of those which are designed for youth, and yet cast their roots into the economic and social activities of the community is probably of the greatest value. The influence for good of the 4-H clubs in the agricultural districts of the Middle West can hardly be exaggerated, and that influence seems to spring mainly from the fact that young people are included in the activities of adults in enterprises designed to improve the life of the community as a whole.²³

The definition which underlies the discussions in this volume states definitely that secondary education is responsible for guiding and promoting the development of normal individuals who are not yet prepared to participate effectively in society unguided by the school. Since 1929 more than twelve million boys and girls have left school. A large number of these have found no place in society either because of insufficient preparation for participation in it, or because, though prepared, society as it is constituted had no work for them to do. The harmful effect of this situation

²²A. L. Quintance: *The Apple-tree Caterpillar*, Farmers' Bulletin No. 662. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1921.

²³For an appraisal of the influence of many different societies and clubs, see H. Hartshorne, M. A. May, and F. K. Shuttlesworth: *op. cit.*, Chap. VII, "Play and Work as Community Functions," pp. 103-117.

upon the attitudes and ideals of youth has been obvious to all interested observers.

The present situation, then, makes it doubly important that secondary education should stand by boys and girls until they have become adjusted in society. But the secondary school can do this only through active coöperation with other community agencies actuated by the same interest. Though available agencies of this nature vary greatly with the geographical situation of the school, yet there is hardly a secondary school which is not out of touch with at least one of them. The underlying philosophy, organization, methods, and procedures of forty such agencies concerned with improving the attitudes and ideals of youth are described in a recent publication.²⁴

Examples of active coöperation between school and community which have directly or indirectly an effect on the establishment of desirable attitudes and ideals in youth have been assembled and described in a recent publication of the Office of Education.²⁵ Some of these had their origin in response to situations which resulted from the depression, others were firmly established before it occurred. In any case the planning of such coöperation ought to be made on a long-time basis, and not merely as a reply to an emergency. As long ago as 1912 Boston created the Department for the Extended Use of the Public Schools, thus permitting the use of school buildings for activities after school hours. The wisdom of this provision was very clearly seen in the year 1933-4, when of the 826,845 persons participating in the civic, social-educational, recreational, and industrial activities at the school centers one third were unemployed youths of both sexes.²⁶ An example of an extra-school agency which is specially adapted to support the efforts of the school to develop good citizens is the Junior Municipality of Cortland, New York. This plan, which is spreading to neighboring counties, provides the means by which through real activities youth may gain a knowledge and an appreciation of government in city, village, township, and county. An excellent example of coöperation for broader purposes is that which resulted from combining the influence of the school with the interests of several other agencies concerned with creating better guidance and fuller

²⁴H. Pendry, and H. Hartshorne: *Organizations for Youth: Leisure Time and Character-Building Procedures*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1935.

²⁵*Youth: How Can Communities Help?* Washington, D. C. United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, September, 1935. (Mimeographed.) This is the precursor of a number of bulletins and leaflets to be prepared by the Committee on Youth Problems.

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 39.

opportunity for the youth of Breathitt County in Kentucky. This was a two-way program directed first at a better provision in the school itself for the adjustment of boys and girls to life conditions, and to the development of their attitudes and ideals; and second directed toward providing guidance for adolescents after leaving school in order to improve their vocational and avocational adjustments. The development of emergency junior colleges in Connecticut, Ohio, and Michigan is evidence of similar coöperation elsewhere.²⁷

One of the earliest examples of coöperation between school and community for the establishment of desirable attitudes and ideals is the Berkeley (California) Coördinating Council, which originated in 1919 with the object of making Berkeley a better place in which to live. Originating through the coöperation of the Assistant Superintendent and the Chief of Police, the Council has gradually developed to include among others the City Manager, the Health Director, the Chief of the Juvenile Probation Court, and the Director of Playgrounds. "Among the results of the Council's activities have been research projects and field studies to reveal community conditions needing attention, a child guidance and behavior research clinic, . . . and a junior council to assure youth participation in community affairs."²⁸

An example from Pennsylvania on a much smaller scale may also be mentioned in conclusion, since the project involved a combination of what is considered in this sub-section (No. 3) with that which follows (No. 4); in other words it was a plan for coöperation with extra-school agencies, participation in activities beneficial to community, and study of present problems of democracy all in one. Eleventh and twelfth grade boys from several eastern secondary schools took over a carefully planned eight-weeks reconstruction program under the guidance of one of the service organizations concerned in the rehabilitation of stranded miners in one of the dead coal towns of western Pennsylvania. These boys contributed their services and paid their own expenses. The evenings were devoted to discussions with owners of coal mines, representatives of labor, economists, government experts engaged in other remedial work, social workers in other fields and of different racial origin, and representatives of widely different approaches to present social and economic problems. The testimony of participating students indicated

²⁷Walter J. Greenleaf: "Emergency Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, Vol. V, pp. 329-431 (May, 1935).

²⁸*Youth, etc., op. cit.*, p. 8.

that this eight-weeks work project was among the most profitable experiences of their lives.

4. *Secondary school students must have adequate opportunity for the study of social and economic questions which they must face as citizens, and these questions must be presented to them in the light of all the pertinent facts.*

Evidence has already been adduced in support of the opinion that attitudes and beliefs become more enlightened and mutually consistent through the experience of studying present problems affecting the lives of students.

5. *Teacher training institutions must concern themselves that candidates for positions as teachers be persons of rectitude and sincerity, that they approach the practice of their profession with a full consciousness of the importance of attitudes and ideals, and that they receive training in regard to the means by which attitudes and ideals may best be developed in school activities.*

ISSUE IX*

Shall secondary education seek merely the adjustment of students to prevailing social ideals, or shall it seek the reconstruction of society?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

The argument that secondary education should seek the adjustment of the individual to prevailing social ideals rests upon the belief that, while social change is desirable, in fact inevitable, the direction of this change in a democracy is the responsibility of the majority of the adult public. Consequently, future citizens should be prepared by the schools to participate effectively in producing changes when their time comes, but they should not be committed in advance to any specific program of reform. In fact, the principal function of the school in this respect is to dispose pupils to accept, at least tentatively, the conclusions of their elders and to act in accordance with them. Only in this way will the majority of men come to live in harmony with each other and coöperate for common ends.

The argument on the other hand that secondary education should seek the reconstruction of society is urgently presented in opposition to the principle of adjustment as indicating the only way in which the American people can save and revitalize their democracy. Democracy means more than majority rule alone; in its full sense it requires the participation of all members of society in formulating the central purposes of their group life and in working together to achieve them. Consequently, youth should be prepared for their future democratic responsibilities by continuous and

*On account of apparently unreconcilable differences of opinion on several important implications, this issue was not satisfactorily resolved by the Committee. At the final meeting a compromise presentation, entirely satisfactory to no one, was approved, and the secretary was instructed to undertake the almost impossible task of combining two reports that differed in their basic philosophy. There was agreement on the general statement to be made, but some members desired to express a number of other opinions that did not receive unanimous approval. The Committee voted that members might indicate in footnotes to this report any important disagreements that they might have.

Unfortunately this could not be arranged for in time for publication on the predetermined date. No member of the Committee was able to see before it went to press the compromise report as put together by the secretary. Consequently, Chapter Nine should be read as the final of some six or seven reports prepared for the Committee on this issue. It has not been considered in its present form. Although some members of the Committee would probably dissent sharply from several positions taken and although others did not include theses that have been entirely omitted, the report is included to permit publication of the volume by the date set by the postal regulations. It will serve an important purpose if it stimulates discussion and thus leads to some agreements that will direct general practice.

thoughtful participation in the reconstruction of their own life in school, and, imaginatively, in the reconstruction of the larger society of which they are a part. From the greater freedom of thought and action which all citizens would enjoy under this concept of democracy there would develop from the people's thinking a fundamental social theory on the basis of which society could reconstruct its economic and political life. Secondary schools, in preparing the future citizen to voice his desire for change and to be active in getting it, will thus be consciously seeking the reconstruction of society.

The great strength of the argument for adjusting the individual to prevailing social ideals is, of course, that it assists the adjustment which each individual must make to the realities of the world about him, to the current opinions of others, which it is folly to ignore, and to the prevailing customs and conventions under which he must live. The argument, however, has two weaknesses. In the first place, in assuming that social integration requires that all pupils accept all prevailing ideals, the school may actually help to perpetuate those evils of fact and ideal that society should have long since outgrown. Secondly, in assuming that the responsibility for approving and directing social change of every sort is committed to majority rule, the school may fail utterly to set up a program leading to desirable social change.

The great strength of the argument that secondary education should seek the reconstruction of society is that it insists on an obvious fact: society is plainly in great need of reconstruction. The school has an important part to play in this reconstruction; in fact, it must play an important part if society is to go ahead by means of democratic processes. The principle of adjustment is, in emphasis at least, inconsistent with the full participation of all citizens in group affairs, whereas the principle of reconstruction emphasizes this very thing. But it, too, may suffer from over-application. It would then entail all the impracticability of a pure democracy trying to operate for large masses of people. Since in a numerous democracy, the direct participation of the entire group in the solution of their problems must yield to the more workable plan of having the active and forceful individuals represent others in directing the affairs of the State, a policy of adjustment might actually be more productive of change than a policy of giving everybody a hand in reform. Or if "reconstruction" means only the right of the individual to interpret for himself the prevailing social ideals without

changing social practice accordingly, its social import cannot be very great.

While it appears that these conflicting arguments cannot be wholly reconciled without destroying the emphasis peculiar to each, the arguments when fully stated do have certain points in common. Such areas of coincidence are extremely important to educators in providing common ground for a tentative program of action. Both lines of reasoning agree that the schools should dispose pupils favorably to social change, and in this sense, at least, secondary education may be said to seek to enable society to reconstruct itself. It is equally clear that neither argument commits the schools to sponsor specific social reforms, and here is a limit beyond which the urge for reconstruction should not go. But both arguments advocate the active participation of teachers in formulating through public discussion the ideas and ideals of the community under the protection of professional solidarity. And both arguments admit of the importance of adopting in the schools the critical spirit of scientific inquiry in examining large social issues. When in such cases a critical evaluation of a prevailing social ideal leads teachers and pupils to accept that ideal, both the arguments for adjustment and for reconstruction imply that they should practice it, and, in this sense at least, the school should seek to adjust pupils to prevailing ideals. When the critical evaluation of a prevailing social ideal leads teachers and pupils to reject it, neither argument demands that they must profess it hypocritically, although the group should be taught the necessity for discretion, tolerance, courtesy, and balance in getting along with their neighbors. Only when social integration absolutely depends upon conformity to a prevailing ideal need any exceptions be made, and even then the community in considering action may easily over estimate the extent to which an unconventionally minded teacher here and there in the school system can mislead an individual pupil, much less the social group. And finally neither argument advises that a teacher fanatically insist upon subjecting to critical examination all social ideals under all circumstances. Many are debatable only in their specific application and should receive attention only at opportune times.

Helpful as these considerations may be in giving educators something to go by, they do not constitute a final resolution of the issue. This must come through developing in practice techniques of action that will enable secondary education

to come to terms with the demands of the community. It is not to be expected that the community will permit the rapid unsettlement of prevailing mores and habits of mind. The problem of the secondary school is how, in such circumstances, it can protect the necessary freedom of the teacher to deal honestly and realistically with social issues.

The crucial weakness of the secondary school in its dealings with the public is that no one knows what social ideals are really approved by the higher conscience of the time. It is, therefore, proposed as the first and most fundamental step in the satisfactory solution of the problem that the task of discovering and defining the social ideals which can command the adherence of the American people be given over to a commission composed of particularly able and representative minds. The discussion of the ideals so formulated and defined would do more to integrate the people of the country socially and voice their common aims and aspirations than any other specific plan.

The importance of such a statement of national ideals, drawn up by wise leaders and validated by some kind of public referendum, would be inestimable. It might well be a Magna Charta for teachers, who would at last know with some certainty whither society wishes to go. Curriculum making would find in the document its directive goals. In the light of these ideals, the social integration of youth would take on specific meaning and purpose, and the urge which almost all people feel for doing something to improve social conditions and hasten desirable changes in social organization could be directed to specific objectives clearly outlined and unmistakably supported by public approval. Then teachers under fire or seeking public confidence would have something authoritative with which to defend or popularize their work.

Already beginnings have been made in attacking the problem of defining American ideals. The establishment and financing of a commission to carry on this important work is perfectly practical. Few things in education are more urgently needed. When educators can turn to a wise and reasoned statement of what this country's worthiest ideals are, the problem of what the secondary school should do in adjusting pupils to prevailing social ideals, or in preparing them to participate in social change, or in protecting the teacher from unreasonable limitations on his freedom, can be effectively solved.

I. THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

Apologia. As was stated in the Introduction the present Issue revealed differences of opinion within the Committee which provoked more discussion and led to a conclusion less satisfactory to all members of the Committee than any of the other issues. The present treatment summarizes the Committee's approach to the problem and presents a point of view which gained majority approval, but from which individual members of the Committee are free to dissent in many important particulars. Neither alternative of the Issue could be accepted without reservations; an agreement was reached only through definition and compromise.

This dissension does not weaken or invalidate the Committee's position. Since there is no "official view" of American education, the only validity to which its deliberations can pretend is that they represent a sampling under ideal conditions for reflection and discussion of the opinions on important issues of the kind of men who are actively engaged in carrying on the work of the schools. If the state of educational opinion on one of these issues is such that no conclusion can yet be reached that will completely satisfy all parties to the discussion, the Report of the Committee ought to reveal this clash of opinion. Its very difficulties will be illuminating to those who must resolve this issue in practice.

Source of the Issue. This issue has not in the past been prominent in the minds of either the profession or the public, for the prevailing practice of secondary schools has been to teach facts and to attempt to equip youth to "think for themselves" with no great concern for social objectives or outcomes, either radical or reactionary. Such social influence as the schools have had, intentionally or by the chance of organization or the undirected activities of teachers, has unquestionably been toward the adjustment of youth to prevailing social ideals. In the recent past, however, there have been loud demands that secondary education should directly seek the reconstruction of society. Thus far the demands have been, for the most part, the subject merely of debate between innovators and traditionalists, but some teachers in the public schools, dissatisfied with existing social arrangements, have initiated in practice an attempt to direct their pupils toward the acceptance of a program leading to a new social order. There is an issue, consequently, in both theory and practice;

and it should be brought into focus of discussion so that a professional decision may be made that will illuminate the resolution of this issue in the work of secondary schools.

Definition of Alternatives. "Adjustment to" and "reconstruction" are the crucial words in the statement of the issue. Shall secondary education bring peace or a sword to the relationship of its pupils with the society in which they find themselves? Both of these terms connote dynamic, reciprocal processes. In both cases both the individual and his environment are modified by inter-action. There is, however, a difference in emphasis upon the individual's purposeful and active participation in modifying his environment which distinguishes the alternatives sharply from one another. Although the constant element in both is potential change in the environment as well as in the learner, the variable element is the degree of active, responsible participation by the individual in bringing about the change. Ordinarily "adjustment" connotes a minimum and "reconstruction" connotes a maximum of active, responsible participation by the individual in the modification of environmental conditions. "Adjustment" implies docility; "reconstruction" implies aggressiveness; "adjustment," imposition from without; "reconstruction," active direction from within.

Definition of Prevailing Social Ideals. The particular phase of the environment which pupils are to learn either to accept or to modify is the same in both alternatives, although in one it is called "the prevailing social ideals" and in the other, to avoid repetition, simply "society." The discussion centered about "ideals" rather than "practices" because it was felt that no one would object to the improvement of social practices through education provided the improvement was in the direction approved by the ideals, aspirations, hopes, wishes, habits—all the elements making up the "mind-set" of the American people. It is when schools deliberately influence the young to seek other goals than their fathers have sought that conflict results. Hence the "prevailing social ideals" include everything that our present society considers wise and good, leaving out of account the specific means by which it may be achieved. The issue might then be re-stated: "Shall secondary education accept what the majority of citizens consider wise and good and teach pupils to do or to become these things, or shall it deliberately influence pupils to formulate and to pursue other goals which present society might consider unwise or even

wicked, but which seem likely to resolve some of the contradictions and to correct some of the evils of contemporary civilization?"

Both Jesus and Socrates died for their answer to this question. Neither would have had trouble with his contemporaries had he accepted their ideals and taught the young to follow them. Because they turned the young in a direction which their elders did not approve they were persecuted and condemned to die. This is no academic issue. The argument is written in blood—the blood of the wisest and best of mankind.

II. THE CASE FOR ADJUSTMENT

Social Changes Needed. During the past few years the practices of our democratic society and even its ideals have been subjected to an unprecedented flood of criticism. Fewer citizens are complacently satisfied with the social, industrial, economic, and governmental practices than a generation ago, and more, many more, are hospitable to proposals for change. It is obvious that as civilization changes new adaptations of practice are necessary and that new ideals gradually emerge, ideals that need the help of the schools for their interpretation and achievement. The great difficulty is to ascertain what the socially approved ideals are and what new courses of desirable action they indicate. The tendency of education, at least in the United States, has always been to oppose social change and progress, partly through inertia and partly through a conviction based on limited knowledge and imagination that our society is as good as it can ever be. At present education is still a conservative force, resisting more or less unconsciously, but effectively none the less, many and varied attempts to make this a better country in which to live and in which to make a living. Some of these attempts have already been approved by the majority of our people and are embodied in the statutes of the nation. When any ideal is socially approved, it seems obvious that it should have the support of the schools to make it understood and effective.

That there must be changes in our social practices is inevitable. We should welcome both critics and prophets; we should give a hospitable hearing to all that they have to say. The weakness of democracy is that so small a fraction of those who have the suffrage are deeply interested in the issues that affect its perpetuation and its prosperity. A paramount re-

sponsibility of the public schools is to arouse in youth an interest in the issues that concern public welfare, to lead them to understand conditions, especially as they have changed and are changing, to make them aware of the implications of the several possible courses of action, and to stimulate them with an ardent and effective ambition to play their parts, each according to his capacities, in making what seems the best course of action effective. All this is different, very different, from saying that the schools should determine what the best course of action is, and that they should propagandize for one or another before there has been a public decision. As John Dewey has written, "There is an important difference between education with respect to a new social order and indoctrination into settled convictions about that order."¹

Integration Needed. Pending approval by the adult public of desirable changes in the ideals and activities of society, there is unquestioned need for the adjustment of youth to the prevailing social ideals. No one is likely to dissent from the doctrine long taught by all philosophers of education that a certain amount of integration of an individual with his social group is imperative if he is to live happily and effectively. The majority of men complacently conform because, having no ideals different from those of their social group, they live most happily under them. Even the most individualistic genius willingly integrates himself in most matters that he may have the freedom to express himself differently in a few others. There is generous tolerance of divergencies that do not materially interfere with the rights and the welfare of others.

This position is stated, perhaps somewhat too strongly, by Dennis:

Now, few persons in the first twenty or thirty years of their lives, even if given access to the world's fund of social knowledge and Socrates for a tutor, could evolve a workable conceptual scheme of society of their own into which to fit themselves. And if a number of people worked out such schemes, the schemes would all differ, whereas only one scheme of society could be operative for a large group. The problem of civilization is to make one social scheme operative for a given people, and this means, among other requisites, that it must be made explicit. The problem of the school is to help fit people into that scheme. Any opposite philosophy of civilization and education is absurd, impractical, and vicious. It is absurd because no social order that has order can allow its schools to train people in ways deliberately calculated to make large num-

¹John Dewey: *Education and the Social Order*. New York: League for Industrial Democracy, 1934. See also quotations from his writings: *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of The National Society for the Study of Education*, pp. 171-174. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Co., 1926.

bers of them enemies of the social order. It is absurd because the premise of an individual in awful isolation from his group is untenable for any useful hypothesis of social organization. Such an individual cannot exist. The theory of educating individuals rather than citizens is impractical for the same reasons. And it is vicious because it involves an educational technique of false rationalizations and deceit which contributes to mental and emotional unbalance and because it creates a large number of enemies of the social order who do not become creative revolutionists but frustrated escapist, futilely flitting between a real world where they are unfulfilled and a fantasy world of wishful thinking where nothing is ever fulfilled except insanity.²

It is held also by the British liberal, G. D. H. Coles, that:

There is another view (than direct and deliberate indoctrination), far harder to sustain in these days of turmoil. It is that the final purpose of education is not so much to teach people facts or doctrines as to help them to think for themselves. This is the liberal view—with a small "l". . . . For the educational liberal who thinks straight and is not content to remain in a muddle has to go on the realization that men can live together within the framework of a real community—that is on the basis of fellowship rather than coercion—provided that there is among them a large common factor of social faith and a large measure of agreement concerning the basis on which society is to rest. The freedom to think for oneself will tear society to pieces unless this agreement exists in sufficient measure to hold it together as one. . . . The liberal holds . . . that indoctrination should go no farther than is absolutely necessary to secure a firm basis for a society in which freedom can flourish within the limitations that the existence of this necessary minimum implies. . . . What should be indoctrinated is a belief in liberty, which implies a tolerance of other people's beliefs up to the point at which their expression becomes incompatible with the existence of society, and readiness to accept the methods of argument and voting as the arbiters of social change.³

Society has at times been disturbed and offended by aberrations from generally approved ideals, and it has ostracized and otherwise punished individuals who differed from the commonly accepted practices in such matters as religion, sex relations, and political concepts. Society in the United States has never been sufficiently concerned, however, to prepare a definite statement of the ideals and mores that it approves and to see to it that the schools, its agents, teach these to youth in order that they may be cognizant of what the majority endorse and live by. It would seem reasonable that a society that provides schools and even compels youth to attend them should be concerned that youth at least know what its ideals and mores are, that they understand the reasons for their justification,

²Lawrence Dennis: "Education—The Tool of the Dominant Elite." *Social Frontier*, 1:4, pp. 11-14 (January, 1935).

³*The New Statesman and Nation*. Education and Citizenship Supplement (July 14, 1934).

and that they be predisposed to accept them until others that are assuredly better emerge.

Reform. There is no assumption in the preceding section that all of the ideals and practices generally approved by society are immutably the best possible; every sensible person must recognize that as conditions change and as ideals are modified there must be better solutions of social problems, the old as well as the new. It is the duty as well as the right of every individual who has an idea that he thinks will lead to greater social happiness to present it to his fellows and to attempt to convince them of its superiority over what is traditional or common. Such novel ideas are being continually proposed, of course, usually in small informal groups where the majority are rejected and heard of no more. Some appeal to many citizens, and after being modified variously in the crucible of group thought and discussion they become the accepted ideas of society. It is to the interest of society that every proposal be considered fairly and soundly evaluated; it is likely to be so considered and evaluated only if citizens have generally been trained to be concerned with change and to think for themselves in the ways necessary for the promotion of democracy.

What part should the public schools play in this change of social ideals, in this reconstruction, gradual or revolutionary, of society? There are those, on the one hand, who exhort teachers "to utilize education in shaping the society of tomorrow," and, on the other hand, there are those who believe that "the school cannot and should not attempt to solve cultural problems that have not been solved by society itself." It would seem beneficent if teachers knowing precisely the direction that the evolution of society ought to take, a rare contingency, should reveal it so convincingly to youth that they would direct their parents and adults. But it would not be the way of democracy. That requires the determination of progress by the majority of citizens.

Schools Not to Initiate Reforms. With approval of the idea that changes in social ideals and practices should be continuous as conditions in civilization change, and with agreement that many changes are urgently needed at the present time, it is maintained that it is the function of public secondary schools neither to initiate such changes nor to promote those that have not previously been approved by the adult public. This position does not contradict the one taken

in the preceding section, that education should make future citizens more interested and more competent to consider all proposed changes with intelligent independence and more sensible of their responsibility to act on their conclusions.

The denial of the proposal that public schools should attempt to reform society is based on the following arguments:

1. The determination of social change is the responsibility of the adult public.

2. There is no reason to think that at the present time secondary-school teachers have, or are likely soon to have, any especial competence to reform society for its betterment. If reform were left to teachers, it would on the whole be slower than most thinkers agree is desirable, for as a class they are distinctly inclined to conservatism and reaction.

3. Whatever competence teachers have to initiate and promote the reform of society they should exert with the adult public, who must make the final decision.

4. The public or dominant elements in it will not permit an open program of reform that the majority has not approved. Persisting in an attempt to promote it, a teacher is likely to be replaced, probably by a conformist of less social interests.

5. It is not honest surreptitiously to attempt through the education of youth a reform that the public has not approved.

6. Even if successfully inculcated, ideas of reform that are not approved by the public will result in non-integrated, unadjusted, and in most cases unhappy individuals.

7. Society approves ideals that are generally higher than common practices. Adjustments to these ideals is an opportunity and a challenge that will consume the professional energies of all teachers.

Indoctrination. It is clear that education should continue and improve its efforts to teach a concern with social problems and also the methods of thinking about them and of coming to sound conclusions. This should become a paramount objective of secondary schools in a democracy, sought directly and constantly by the most skilful means possible, rather than, as now too frequently, an indefinite goal aimed at sporadically and indirectly. A reasonable amount of success may confidently be expected with the more competent youth, and any approximation to success will be an improve-

ment on what we now have. Even an appreciation of the method without competence to use it would contribute materially to the wise selection of leaders.

But what of those youth who cannot learn adjustment by means of the ideal method of impartial, unprejudiced, independent thinking? They also must be adjusted to the social ideals of democracy, for they have to associate intimately with their fellows and they have votes to determine how all shall live. They likewise need leadership through education in coming to conclusions that are good for society as a whole. An early American author once wrote, "Take him by the hand kindly, by the arm firmly, by the neck roughly, or by the nose insultingly." This goes to an extreme that we cannot approve, but it does indicate that successive steps progressively less ideal may be necessary to achieve an end that society wants—and that is the assured integration by whatever means necessary of each and every individual with the ideals that have general social approval.

What would the advocates of impartial critical consideration by youth do with a book like that by Ewald Banse, of the Brunswick Technische Hochschule, a one-sided argument for war prepared by a professor of military science holding his chair by an appointment dictated by the German government? It argues that war is inevitable and that therefore it is imperative to know as much about it as possible, that war is to be regarded as a means to an end, that this end is the defense and the amelioration of existence, the highest moral duty of mankind and of states, and that even bacterial poisoning of the enemy is justified to a weak people. The argument is so closely knit that an ordinary layman of good intelligence would have difficulty in making a contrary case with a youth who has intellectual keenness enough to follow the discussion from the militaristic point of view. This illustration of the cogent advocacy of something that we very generally disapprove, an illustration that could be multiplied many times over for similar topics in other fields, is cited to lead to this question: If you were certain that a consideration of such justification of war would be more convincing to a group of high school youth than the arguments which you approve on the other side, should you for the sake of impartial fairness introduce the book into your class as required reading? The position taken here necessitates a negative answer. We are so convinced of the wickedness and futility of war and of a general hostile sentiment in

this country that we should unhesitatingly do everything possible to negate the effects of argument which the immaturity of youth not yet saturated with sentiment for peace could not refute. It is better to integrate youth with the ideal which his elders have approved for a peace-loving democratic society than through quixotic devotion to another ideal of open-mindedness to alienate them from the society in which they must live.

Democratic Method of Indoctrination. We cannot but envy the social integration achieved by foreign nations through the use of their schools, but we condemn and abhor the means that they have used. To us they seem indoctrination of the worst sort, the stultification of youthful intellects that certain political ends may be attained. But perhaps to the leaders in these countries their means seem only reasonable and skilled education, altogether consistent with their philosophy. Their education is certainly predisposing youth to the ideals of the government and inspiring them with both a belief and an emotional loyalty that make the kind of citizens that they desire.

Democracy needs social integration; it needs citizens who believe in its ideals and are so loyal to them that they consistently seek the democratic way of life. Most of the social and political ills from which we suffer result from a citizenry not so educated that they have this intelligent pragmatic loyalty. It can be achieved by one means only, an education, carefully planned and skilfully given, to make youth understand the principles on which democracy is founded and predisposed to believe in them. Inculcation of democratic ideals must use not the means of the Fascist or the monarchist, but the means of democracy. These will involve the constant effort to make citizens not only intelligent about its principles but also concerned to find and to use the wisest application of them to arrive at conclusions beneficent for society as a whole and for all of its individual members. Our schools must educate in the best sense, with the limitations previously discussed, in order that society may preserve itself and promote its best interests.

The area of education devoted to adjustment is small, but at the same time it is highly important. Education for intellectual interests and for vocational effectiveness, which now comprises the major part of the program, is only slightly involved; but education for participating satisfactorily in the

social and political life of the nation can be effective only if the issue now being discussed is decided so that a program can be built that will contribute positively to one alternative or to the other. "The most distinctive peculiarity of the school, as one of the legion of human institutions that educate, is that it educates with consciously conceived and willed purposes." We must agree on what those purposes should be. A person cannot really know a fact independently of an attitude toward the social scheme in which he lives and in which he wishes to live. Men are socially effective only as they have good attitudes toward the social scheme. A democratic education should lead youth to "examine the evils of society realistically and thereby, develop a moral indignation and a hatred for wrong, injustice, exploitation, poverty, racial intolerance, and corruption." Not only that; it should lead youth to examine society so that they will develop clear understanding of and devotion to the positive principles on which our society is founded and accept responsibility for acting intelligently in accord with those principles for the general good. Such social effectiveness as education has had in the past has been far more negative than positive; it has indoctrinated youth as to what it should hate rather than as to what it should admire and devotedly follow.

Our secondary schools are peculiarly fit agencies for thus adapting youth to the prevailing social ideals, for in them the students have come to such maturity that they can be led to understand and to make intelligent judgments about ideals and consequent conduct. They are already to a considerable extent concerned with the problems of society and are hungry for leadership. No small proportion of youth has already been strongly influenced by other agencies that may or may not be working for the good of society as a whole; and in various places, especially in foreign lands, there are "youth movements," often with abortive and misdirected efforts to achieve an imperfectly understood "reform" destructive of what the prevailing society approves. The eagerness and the potentialities of youth should be appreciated and directed by society through its schools for the highest common good. Our secondary schools have been suffering from an indefiniteness of social purpose and from a lack of unified and convincing leadership. A decision on this issue will give the basis for developing what they need.

Undirected Individuals May Not Use Schools. It is unthinkable that non-conforming individuals, especially those

who take the pay of society and accept responsibility for carrying out its program, should be permitted to use the schools for their own purposes without control or direction, to take advantage of their official positions to influence youth toward ideals and practices that have not received the sanction of the employing public. But that is precisely what has been argued. To permit this is to deny the whole theory that education is a function of society to perpetuate and to improve itself. It is to resign the highly important function of society into the hands of individuals who have no check, unless they happen to offend some citizen who is powerful enough to effect the repression of the activity. It is freely admitted that most of those who wish to use the schools to reform society are altruistic and that they hold what they consider higher ideals than those prevailing in society, but opposition to indoctrination for even such ideals is based on the principle that adult society is in responsible control and must first decide what reforms it wishes. There have already been some instances, as noted by Dr. O'Shea, former superintendent of schools in New York, of teachers "who persist in teaching subversive doctrines and continue to use their positions in the public schools to sow seeds of disloyalty to our country and a misunderstanding of its principles." Any parent would be unwilling to permit a teacher whom he selects and pays for educating his child to warp the latter's judgment against ideals and practices which he endeavors to exemplify in his own life. Society is just a plural parent.

Rights of a Dissenting Teacher. Has the teacher with ideals that run counter to the prevailing social ideals no right to advocate them? He certainly has—not only the right but, as a good citizen, the duty and the obligation. He has no right to take advantage of his official position to propagandize toward his own peculiar ideals, either openly or surreptitiously, children who are too immature and too uninformed with either facts or experience to think through social problems in all of their aspects and implications. He who believes that there should be significant changes in our social ideals has a prime responsibility to present his arguments to his fellow citizens, who as partners in the great fellowship of democracy will accept or reject his proposals. It is with the adult public that the reformer must be ready "to accept responsibility, to suffer calumny, to surrender security, to risk both reputation and fortune;" or from the adult public, on the other hand, that he must receive the scepter of leadership and its rewards.

Only with approval from the adult public has the reformer, then, the right to use the powerful instrument of education to lead youth to an understanding and conviction of the righteousness of the proposed ideals.

Snedden has well expressed this position in regard to the teacher of social sciences.⁴ What he says is equally applicable to all teachers. "The social science teacher in his capacity as public servant has no rights of teaching that which seems good or true to him, quite irrespective of the collective opinion or valuation of the society, and largely controlling majority thereof, which he serves. He has here heavy obligations as agent or employee of the public either to meet its demands or to withdraw from its service. If his conscience and judgment convince him that he is right, then his correct course is to detach himself from the service of the state and to undertake propaganda in his private capacity. . . .

"The social teacher may often be of minority groups. In these connections he is entitled to hold such opinions as he sees fit. But *teaching* is his field of social behavior. Here in his public capacity he must conform to the will of the majority, so far as overt act or influence is concerned, uphold the social order under such democratic auspices as now represent the democratically expressed will of the majority."

Academic Freedom. The principle of academic freedom does not here apply. That abused and often perverted principle is still sound in its original sense. But there is a difference, a vast difference, between the freedom that a scholar on the one hand, should and must have to declare the results of his investigations and reflections in the field in which he is competent and expert, and the freedom of any and every teacher, on the other hand, to advocate in his classroom idiosyncratic ideas not yet substantiated by accepted facts and philosophy and not yet approved by the supporting public. Even the expert in mathematics or physics has no justifiable academic freedom to expound in his classroom or as a university officer theories and conclusions on sociology or government. It is altogether irrational to argue that any secondary-school teacher, however biased his attitude, however partial his inadequate consideration of incomplete data, however erratic his judgment, has the right officially to use his influence for the subversion of the society that has in good faith

⁴David Snedden: *Civic Education*, pp. 276-78. Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Co., 1932. See also his chapter: "Freedom of Teaching in Secondary Schools." Also his article: "Liberty of Teaching in Social Sciences." *School and Society*, VIII: 320, pp. 181-91 (February 12, 1921).

entrusted him with responsibility and pays him a wage to perform his duties loyally. Of course some teachers—many, it may be admitted for the sake of the argument—have ideals that may be superior to those held by the public or that the public is yet willing to approve. But where and how could a discriminating line be drawn? The only sound conclusion, it is held, is that reform by means of the public schools must follow and not precede the ideals that the public is convinced are in accord with the general principles of the democratic life.

Before embarking on a campaign to give every public school teacher, the competent as well as the others, the right to teach what he pleases and how he pleases, we might well be more active to insure to him the right to advocate outside the school what his judgment leads him to think is best, the right to do this without imperiling his job. That his job is imperiled by activity for social and political reform is too well manifested by innumerable instances in all parts of the country. Even the teachers who resent most bitterly any limitation upon their right to teach what they believe in are frequently the harshest critics of others who wish the right to advocate their convictions. A man is a citizen before he is a teacher. As a citizen he should be assured all the rights of free speech and an independent vote; as a teacher he is a servant of society, which is, or should be, controlled by a majority of citizens, and as such he must speak for that majority rather than for himself.

Summary. The position here taken is that schools should attempt, consistently and skilfully to adjust youth to prevailing ideals. They should make a maximum attempt to inculcate in youth the principles on which democracy is founded, to interest them in social problems, and to produce the skill and habit of independent judgment and courageous action based on it. After all possible is done for this end, the schools should then exert their influence to make youth predisposed to favor what their elders have agreed is best for the general good. This influence should be exerted not by indoctrination in a bad sense, closing the mind and using the individual as an ignorant dupe, but by directed experience, leading to intelligent conclusions consistent with democratic principles.

III. THE CASE FOR RECONSTRUCTION

Democracy. The case for the deliberate predisposition of youth by secondary education to reconstruct society rests chiefly upon the argument that only education of this sort is consistent with and adapted to the dynamic character of a modern democratic society. Democracy is itself a dynamic term. It is a form of group life; and life, whether individual or group, exists only where there is a reorganization of the results of environmental stimuli into new forms of control on the part of the organism. All social groups are alive and grow in the sense that there is a constant reorganization of experience so that the group may deal more adequately with environmental conditions. Democracy, however, differs from other forms of group life in that it emphasizes the development of the greatest possible degree of self-control and self-direction on the part of the individuals who make up the group. This implies that democracy must encourage the individual to identify himself as an active, responsible participant with the life of the group. As a member of a democracy the individual must share as fully as possible the purposes of the group; he must be concerned about having others share these purposes; he must be concerned about the worthiness of these purposes; he has a responsibility for being as intelligent as possible in perfecting the means through which these purposes are realized.

Education and Democracy. Education has sometimes been called synonymous with life. This is probably on the assumption that since life involves a reorganization of experience in the direction of greater control of the environment by the individual, and since education also implies reorganization of experience, therefore life is education. But this reorganization is often achieved in life through the blind interplay of forces, whereas in education it must be directed in ever increasing measure by the intelligence of the learner. At least this is the definition which we must give to education if we have faith in democracy and desire a form of education adapted to furthering the growth of a democracy.

Some education can, of course, be defined as life: in other words as the reorganization of experience that results from the blind interplay of forces. It can also be defined as the interplay of forces, human and environmental, wherein there is a minimum of emphasis upon intelligent self-direction by

the learner. There is of necessity much education of this kind with plants and animals and with the very young of the human species. Such education lends itself to the purposes of a society in which it is assumed that God has designated a certain group or class to think and another class to do. But in a democracy, which by definition is a society that consciously seeks the widest possible degree of responsible participation and intelligent self-direction, we must of necessity define education to place emphasis upon the growth of intelligent self-direction. Hence it follows that teachers in a democracy must have faith not only in democracy as a way of life but faith in the wide spread application of intelligence as an instrument through which democracy re-creates and perpetuates itself.

Society and the Issue. The society which we call America is by no means unanimous in its faith in democracy, as herein defined. Many, while professing faith in democracy, do not believe in the necessity for wide spread participation in the formulation of society's purposes and practices, nor do they believe in the reëxamination and reëvaluation of social purposes as a requirement for the perpetuation of democracy; nor do they see in the widespread application of intelligence the instrument *par excellence* through which democracy re-creates itself. For them democracy connotes only certain forms of government, certain political practices, certain shibboleths such as "rugged individualism" or "unrestricted competition." Criticism of these concepts they fear; faith in the intelligence of the common man seems to them nonsensical; widespread and responsible participation they deplore as likely to upset their way of life. Any attempt at an interpretation of democracy which implies widespread, intelligent, and responsible participation they oppose by branding its proponents as "Reds" and "Radicals." Name-calling and branding as anti-social has always been a favorite weapon of those who would protect their vested interests and prevent change.

It may be questioned whether those who hold the above views are the rightful guardians of the American tradition. It may be argued that in the American tradition there is ample warrant for assuming that democracy is a changing, growing organism which adapts itself as intelligently as it can to changing conditions; that it seeks the widest possible participation by its members in the formulation of its purposes and procedures; that it seeks to develop in its members more and more power of intelligent self-direction; that it

values highly having the individual identify himself with the welfare of society, as a responsible participant in shaping society's purposes and procedures. There are those in America who believe that democracy connotes all of this and more, and there seems to be reason for believing that they, rather than the former group, are the real guardians of the American tradition.

Society and Education. Since society is divided in its opinion about the nature of democracy, it follows that it must also be divided in its opinions concerning the nature and function of education. One can not very well believe that democracy gives to the powerful man the unrestricted right to exploit his neighbors, provided he is shrewd enough, and at the same time believe in an education that probes into the purposes and practices of the powerful. Conversely, one can not very well believe that the strength of democracy rests upon the intelligent participation in its affairs by the largest possible number of its members and at the same time believe that education should predispose, by a process of adjustment to prevailing ideals, the electorate to accept uncritically the propaganda of press, radio, and movie.

Society and the Educator. This division within society as to the meaning of democracy impinges with particular force upon the educator and presents a challenge which he must accept fearlessly if the education he directs is to continue to have force and vitality. There is but one way he can go if he is really concerned about democracy: that is in the direction of helping to reinterpret democracy's ideals in terms of changing conditions. To go the other way, the direction of helping to perpetuate old and outmoded interpretations, defeats society on two counts: the ideals cease to have vitality and democracy falters; and the generation that comes on lacks the experience for the reinterpretation which inevitable crises will demand of it. If the educator believes that democracy involves more and more widely shared purposes, greater power of self-direction on the part of the individual, more intelligent and devoted participation in the affairs of the state by all members of the social group, is not his responsibility as an educator clear? Must he not so organize education that there are more opportunities for the child to learn through participation, more opportunities for the child to act purposefully and intelligently, more advocacy of education as

"reconstruction" and less advocacy of it as "docile acceptance of prevailing interpretations of society's ideals"?

Questions Raised by the Preceding Discussion. In the preceding discussion we have undoubtedly raised more questions than we have settled. We have not paused to develop the implications of assertions, many of them unsupported, for we wished to get the issue before the reader in as sharply a contrasted form as possible. The balance of the discussion will concern itself with questions which may be asked concerning the position taken with respect to the function of the school.

1. *What validity is there in making "the desire for change" a point of difference between those who advocate "adjustment to prevailing ideals" and those who advocate "reconstruction of society"? Do not we all want change?*

Indeed we do. Change is in fact the common element in the two concepts. They differ mainly as to the kind of change that is desired and as to how and by whom it shall be brought about. The change advocated by the one who believes in adjustment to "rugged individualism," "unrestricted competition" and other prevalent misinterpretations of democracy is the change that would further restrict intelligent and purposeful and critical participation. Those, on the other hand, who believe that widespread purposeful participation is the essence of democracy would want change which would extend the participation. The first group fails to recognize that social change, in so far as it involves the life of a democracy, must be change in the direction of more general participation in directing social change. Change in the direction of more restricted participation destroys democracy.

2. *Must an ideal have legal enactment or majority approval through other legally constituted procedures before it can be called "an approved ideal"?*

The present widespread questioning of social and political institutions is evidence of the fact that legislation may lag behind the actual crystallization of public opinion on vital questions. The very work of this Committee on the Reorientation of Secondary Education would be impossible unless we assumed that we have the right to criticize existing legal provisions for education. We have even assumed that it is within our rights to secure the use of these reports in university classes so that "impressionable adolescent minds" there molded may catch a new vision of what secondary education

might be, even though that vision involves practices not now legal in the sense of being enacted into law. No, if we are to look to legislatures for an adequate and up-to-the-minute interpretation of the American tradition, we are destined to be disappointed. The feeble compromises that emerge from those halls cannot light democracy's way. Better far that we trust our poets, our novelists, our essayists, our ministers, and our more articulate statesmen as they attempt through speech and writing to interpret democracy to itself.

As a further example of the discrepancy between the ideal and attempts at its legal embodiment, let us take the ideal of a "free tax-supported public education for all youth". One would be interpreting correctly the American tradition, I believe, if one said that such an educational system is a "prevailing social ideal". Yet this ideal falls far short of complete embodiment in the form of supporting legislation. In fact, to advocate it in certain sections would be as much as one's job is worth. Should the school desist from criticizing the failure to make this provision or cease to criticize the legal enactments that discriminate between poor children and rich children within a given State? Majority opinion as it finds expression in law is often a pale and twisted shadow of the real desires of the American people.

Certainly in our college classes we do not assume that it is adequate instruction merely to "adjust" the adolescent to the ideal of free public education as it finds expression in legal enactment. We spend most of our time, if the writer's experience with college instructors is any criterion, in pointing out to the student how the law should be changed so that this ideal might be more nearly realized.

Who, then, shall interpret the American ideal? That is something which in the final analysis each one must do for himself and in relation to the special responsibility which he has as a member of society. That is one of our distinctive responsibilities and prerogatives as citizens of a democracy. Since we who teach have as our responsibility helping the young to interpret these ideals, it matters tremendously whether our own understanding of these ideals is limited to what legislatures have written in statute books, which we pass on unaudited, or whether we bring to the task of interpretation critical analysis and constructive imagination.

The teacher-citizen in a democracy has no less responsibility than the lawyer-citizen or the doctor-citizen to reinterpret constantly our social ideals in relation to this task,

and having done that it surely could not be advocated that he should transform himself by some magical process into a purveyor of the unaudited interpretation of others (one wonders which of many) to the children under his care.

3. *Does the position here taken imply that the teachers shall have the right to "inculcate any ideals in which they individually believe"?*

It is unthinkable that individuals should be permitted to use the agency of the schools for their own selfish purposes, or that they should take advantage of their official positions to undermine society. It is just as unthinkable as it would be to defend a doctor's right to poison his patients or a lawyer's right to help his clients violate the law. Each has a professional responsibility to those who seek his services and that responsibility is a reflection of what society conceives to be for the best interest of the individual as a member of that society. In the case of the teacher that responsibility involves helping the child to become an intelligent, coöperative, and responsible participant in the life of the community.

For the teacher in a democracy acceptance of this responsibility should imply:

1. That the teacher has faith in democracy as a way of group life, (i. e. he believes in working for the widest possible participation in the formulation of society's purposes and in the devising of ways and means for the achievement of these purposes).
2. That he has faith in intelligence as the instrument through which democracy re-creates and perpetuates itself, (i. e. he believes in working to secure wherever possible a deliberate, dispassionate solution to social problems with the entire group concerned participating in the thinking).
3. That he conceives of education as the means whereby society is helped to deal more intelligently with its problems and to reformulate its purposes and plans in the light of changed conditions.

Such a declaration of faith as the above would be far more justifiable as a requirement than the existing one that he uphold the Constitution. Not that the upholding of the Constitution is undesirable, but it is conceivable that one's conception of what is involved in upholding the Constitution may be quite at variance with what is necessary for the preservation of democracy. Granted such a faith in democracy and in intelligence, the teacher, in common with other professional people, must be given freedom to work at his task of develop-

ing intelligence in the only way in which it can be done successfully: namely, by helping pupils to use their intelligence. One should not have to argue that, in order to perform this task, he should be free to use his own intelligence.

There will, of course, be teachers who lack the faith we have stipulated as necessary. Also there will be those who will be inept—but why we should therefore issue a blanket warning to all against the independent exercise of their intelligence, the writer can not understand. The teacher who deliberately shirks his professional responsibility and takes advantage of his position to secure uncritical acceptance of ideas subversive of democracy would have negligible influence in a group of teachers of the faith outlined above.

4. *Does not the zealous furthering of democratic principles involve indoctrination as a function of the school?*

Earlier in this paper the statement was made that "some education can be defined as life," i. e. as the reorganization of experience that results from the blind interplay of forces, human and environmental. It can also be defined as the interplay of forces controlled from without by a governmental agency or by an adult in the form of a teacher or parent. In this there may be a minimum of emphasis upon the intelligent self-direction of the learner. Such learning we commonly designate as "indoctrination". Much education is of necessity of this kind.

Where ideals are involved that seem crucial to the adult, the educative process is apt to be of this nature. The adult predisposes the youth to reverence for motherhood, belief in the virtue of strenuous toil and thrift, respect for majority decisions, faith in democracy and in intelligence. Since it is all-important in a society in which these are prevailing ideals that one have these dispositions if one is to be happy, there is said to be no great point in quibbling about how one gets them, provided one gets them.

The rub comes, however, in that uncritical acceptance, is not enough to make these ideals effective in the life of youth. Of itself it does not breed a race of men capable of perpetuating democracy. Members of a democracy must be made of sterner stuff; their young must as rapidly as possible take over the responsibility for self-direction, self-control, and purposeful participation in social change or they will not learn effectively how to conduct themselves as members of a democracy. Democracy by definition is a society which con-

sciously seeks for the widest possible degree of responsible participation and intelligent self-direction; education in a democracy, as a matter of plain common sense, must provide opportunities for the development of these powers in its young.

If one could, by listening to preachments, learn to think or to plan coöperatively or to act independently and fearlessly, much could be said for the method as a saver of time and energy; but as a matter of fact one can not and does not learn to do any of these things effectively except by doing them. Preachments serve to enhance the satisfaction one gets from success in these socially desirable activities; preachments also serve to predispose one to try them or to continue in them when the way is hard; but by themselves preachments produce only illusions.

This matter of learning through purposeful participation is always crucial in a democracy, and providing for it presents a serious problem. This problem is of peculiar significance today with the greatly diminished opportunities for youthful participation in the work of the world, both in and out of his home. Youth is coming to feel that he is not needed, that there is no place for him; and schools tend to become cloisters and sanctuaries where youth may chew his cud of disappointment while he waits for a chance to live. The educator, sensing somewhat youth's need to belong, his desire for a responsible part to play in some social group, tries to make over his curriculum so that it involves more first hand experiences that are socially useful; and for his pains the world derides him saying that he is trying to make play of education. He tries again by bringing into the classroom economic and social and political problems of current interest so that youth may participate, at least vicariously, in the life of his community.—and for his pains he is made the object of attack by patrioteers who accuse him of seeking to destroy society. What he is really trying to do, rather blunderingly oft times, it must be admitted, is to save democracy.

We look at Communist youth and Fascist youth, and while we cannot agree with the purpose of their zeal, we are impressed by their purposefulness, their self-discipline, their conviction that they belong and that they have a mission in life. We wish that our own youth might be characterized by the same serious devotion to an ideal. There is one way to do it, and only one that is lastingly effective, and that is to

make it possible for them to live their ideal—in our case the ideal of democracy.

The Issue Again. The real point at issue in this discussion is how democracy may be saved and developed. The position here taken on the issue is that in so far as the term "adjustment to prevailing ideals" implies "docility", "uncritical acceptance of", "imposition from above or without", "unquestioning conformity" it lends itself as a method altogether too readily to those who would destroy democracy and should therefore be opposed. In so far as adjustment implies learning to think critically, to participate purposefully in social programs, to act fearlessly from conviction, it is good; but this sense is seldom given to the term by its protagonists.

On the other hand, in so far as "reconstruction of society" implies a desire to participate responsibly and intelligently in reformulating society's purposes and programs, in so far as it emphasizes the importance of youth identifying itself as early as possible with the problems of society, in so far as it implies a desire to extend to more members the opportunity to have a responsible part in society's affairs, it promises the only way of saving democracy. However, if it is assumed to mean resort to methods of unreason, force, and revolution, it can not be defended any more than one could defend "docile, uncritical acceptance". In fact, the two would then, in terms of their consequences, mean one and the same thing—the destruction of democracy.

Articles of Faith. 1. We choose to assume that the school should be an agency created by society for the purpose of helping society to re-create and thereby to perpetuate itself.

2. The school, therefore, should have a responsibility to help society to examine critically and to evaluate its objectives and practices. Unless the school does this, society stagnates and crises overtake it. A democracy continues to live only if it continues to develop—to develop broader and worthier purposes and to develop better means for the achievement of its purposes.

3. Society must, therefore, in its own interest protect the school in its exercise of this critical and evaluative function. It cannot obviously make this demand of the school without also insuring to the school the freedom it needs to perform the function.

4. The result of this effort by society, under the leadership of the school, to reconstruct progressively its objectives and its practices should result in an indigenous social theory—a social theory which can find expression not only in the classroom but in all other educative agencies, such as the radio, the press, the movie, the playground, etc.

5. The development of such an indigenous social theory in America requires the development of certain faiths in and by the teachers in our schools:

- a. faith in democracy as a way of life. (i. e. faith in the widest possible participation, etc.)
- b. faith in the orderly steps of social evolution guided by intelligence as the method through which democracy re-creates and perpetuates itself. (i. e. faith in the method of deliberate dispassionate attack on social problems with the entire social group concerned participating in some measure in the thinking.)
- c. faith in the essential soundness of the position that the school exists as the most important public agency through which democracy is helped to refine its purposes and to come to a clearer understanding of its essential ideals.

6. The implementation of these faiths will change from time to time as we deal collectively with the problems of group life, but if we would avoid drift and unnecessary confusion we cannot shirk the responsibility for attempting such implementation—both in terms of school practice and in terms of principles of economic and political organization such as are expressed in the report of the Committee on the Social-Economic Goals for America.

7. If it is to render this essential service to the whole of society, the school must be protected by society from undue influence by pressure groups, which must be interested in their own group welfare rather than in the welfare of society as a whole. These groups are not public in the sense that the school is public: they are not created by society for the service of society as a whole.

IV. THE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUE

Reviewing the Arguments. It is hoped that the case for both alternatives of the issue under discussion has been not only fairly but warmly and sympathetically presented. If the devotees of either cause deplore the absence of some of their

favorite arguments, they may ascribe it to the frailty, not to the intention, of the authors. As may be guessed from differences in style and manner of presentation, each of the preceding sections of this discussion was written by a member of the Committee who sincerely believed in the cause he was presenting.

There remains the unwelcome task of reviewing the arguments presented, of exposing their weaknesses and of pooling their strengths in the light of the discussion which these opposing points of view aroused in the Committee. In undertaking this task there is a grain of comfort to be extracted from the fact that the authors agree that democracy should be preserved. Although they protest too much, their faith seems to be sound. They may thus be cleared at the start of any suspicion of treason.

The Case for Adjustment. The case for adjustment runs somewhat as follows: It is admitted that change is desirable and inevitable, but in a democracy the responsibility for directing this change rests with the majority of the adult public. Future citizens should be predisposed to change, they should be trained in the methods of thinking and factual background necessary to direct change wisely, but they should not be committed in advance to specific changes, for this would transfer the control of public affairs from the majority of citizens to a minority group—the teaching profession. Thus the school may *seek* but not *plan* the reconstruction of society. Pending the approval of changes by the adult public, children should be educated to accept and live by the prevailing social ideals. In so far as it is possible this should be done through independent critical thinking on social issues. Where children lack the capacity or the experiential background for such thinking, however, they should be led to accept at least tentatively the conclusions of their elders. This tentative acceptance must be supported by emotional approval if it is to lead to social action in any consistent direction. Only thus can the majority of men be brought to live in harmony with one another and to coöperate for common ends in the light of commonly understood and commonly accepted principles. The teacher who dissents from these principles should plead his cause before the adult public, and be guaranteed tenure of office while so doing by professional solidarity; but pending approval of his cause, he has no ethical right to predispose children to accept his conclusions since they have not yet the capacity or background to direct

social change wisely, and since they are thereby alienated in some measure from that social integration which it is the business of secondary education to promote.

Criticism of the Case for Adjustment. Most of the foregoing argument can be accepted by both sides of the present controversy. Some specific limitations, however, may be briefly discussed.

1. Since democracy was consistently used as the example of the social ideals to be inculcated, a somewhat too favorable picture was created of the probable social consequences of this position. Among the social ideals and attitudes that the teacher might have to use all the resources of his scientific training to inculcate in various sections of the country are: chauvinistic nationalism, militarism, imperialism, racial inequality, rugged individualism, unrestricted competition, opposition to the critical, questioning attitude in matters of faith and morals, provincialism, anti-Semitism, fundamentalism, indifference to the arts, hostility to taxation, resistance to the extension of the functions of government, contempt for legislative methods, belief in witches, faith-healers, quacks, patent medicines and advertising, the hoarding of wealth, extreme conservatism, opposition to trade unions, the glorification of wealth and power, and so on. These beliefs, opinions, attitudes, and ideals are more widely and firmly held in many localities than the pure faith in democracy as herein defined. Pending change of these habits of mind by the majority of the adult public, the schools would be committed by this position to induct the young into these habits of mind by main strength in case they were unable to arrive at them by independent critical thinking. The educator, of course, might refuse to accept these as social ideals; but if he, rather than the majority of citizens, is to decide what are social ideals and what are not, the argument herein presented for adjustment is invalidated.

2. The argument for adjustment to prevailing social ideals in behalf of social integration seems to assume that social integration requires the acceptance of *all* social ideals that are prevalent at any time in society rather than those specific ideals that make for social integration. Racial inequality, for example, is a prevailing social ideal in every sense of the term in many sections of the country, but its influence is directly counter to social integration. It would be well to tabulate those items of social belief that are essential

for effective coöperation as a society. The list would probably be short and almost universally acceptable. Differences of opinion on other matters would not alienate a pupil from the society in which he must live. A family holding opposed political, social, and religious views can live happily together provided its members are courteous, tolerant, and well-balanced. The principle of social integration could not possibly be extended, for example, to justify the prohibition of the teaching of evolution in Tennessee. It is not essential to the effective coöperation of these people that they be equally ignorant of the fruits of scientific research. The application in practice of the much-abused principle of social integration is more often than not of this character. One should not justify the anti-social effects of offended prejudices in the name of social integration.

3. The argument for adjustment assumes that the responsibility for approving and directing social change of every sort is committed to majority rule. On the contrary, the rule of the majority, even in a democracy, extends only to certain selected values that are traditionally the concern of the social group. There is no provision in our political system for legislating a change of heart regarding anti-Semitism. We have never declared as a people that we accept the ideal of individual, competitive success, nor could we modify this ideal directly through legislation. These are social beliefs and attitudes of immense consequence, but they change and develop without regard to majority decisions. The social changes brought about by science and the industrial revolution were never decreed by a majority. The changing status of the American family seems to be thoroughly disapproved by legislators, yet it changes in spite of them. Religious ideals are specifically exempted from the rule of the majority in our Constitution. Freedom of the press is similarly assured, even though this freedom gives the minority group which controls the newspapers the same position of special influence over the direction of social change that is deplored and resisted in its much safer application by the public schools. The teaching profession has been given extended training by society for the purpose of making it unusually competent in guiding the social behavior of youth. It therefore becomes one of the many influences beside majority rule that operate in society to produce change. If this influence is to be regulated to insure that it operates in directions which the majority now approves, this same regulation must

logically be extended to scientists, inventors, artists, preachers, journalists, and captains of industry. These and many similar groups introduce changes into our national life that have not previously been approved by the majority of citizens. Let us proceed at once to enact the law: hereafter let no one in our society discover or proclaim any new truth or take any action which may lead to social change until this change has been specifically approved by the majority of citizens eligible to vote.

4. The practical consequences of this position, regardless of its merit in theory, would be bad from almost every point of view. The teaching profession, through long exposure to the fury of offended prejudice, has become in matters of social concern perhaps the most craven, inert, spineless, goose-stepping, ineffective body of citizens in the land. Let any infuriated mother descend upon the school and announce that her child has questioned the sanctity of the framers of the Constitution and a veritable reign of terror begins. Authority bellows down the corridors, the culprit is haled to justice, and his quaking colleagues hide in the cellar until the storm blows over. Teacher after teacher may be discharged for offending some petty local prejudice and not a voice is raised in protest. To justify in an influential report the continued exposure of teachers to all the powers of darkness in the hallowed name of democracy would not only exacerbate their social nullity; it would play into the hands of all the forces of Fascism which are alert to every pretext to seize control of the organs influencing public opinion. Some fanatics would quote from every paragraph of such a report to intimidate teachers who dissent from his views. The school superintendent who plays the role of "gripe-absorber" to the local patriots would put the document into the hands of every teacher who was "making trouble"—with passages marked and underlined. The net result would be the further restriction of the potential social usefulness of the teaching profession. What would teachers be like if they were given a single generation of assured freedom from interference with their professional duties?

The Case for Reconstruction. The case for reconstruction was argued somewhat as follows: Only education which seeks the reconstruction of society is consistent with and capable of realizing and perpetuating the fundamental principles of democracy. Democracy connotes more than the rule

of the majority: it rests upon the underlying assumption that all members of a society should participate in formulating its central purposes and coöperate in achieving them. This definition may be disputed, but it seems to be supported by the American tradition, and the motives of those who dispute it seem questionable. If this definition is accepted, it follows that the young should be prepared for this responsibility through continuous thoughtful participation in formulating the central purposes of their society (presumably the society of their schoolfellows) and through responsible coöperation in achieving them. They may also participate vicariously in the solution of current social issues through the candid and fearless discussion of these issues in school. Methods of this sort will predispose the young to favor social change in the direction of increasing the participation of all members of society in the direction of its affairs. Only thus may democracy be preserved. Teachers may "interpret" democratic ideals to the young in the light of changed conditions, but should secure the acceptance of these ideals only through their habitual appliation in school life. Teachers may not predispose youth to reject this sort of democracy but with this exception they may lead youth to any conclusion consistent with the exercise of independent critical thinking on the part of the entire group concerned.

Criticism of the Case for Reconstruction. The chief difficulty with the argument for reconstruction is that of following it. The author proposes a new definition of democracy; one wonders on the basis of what evidence or authority, whereat he declares that those who dispute his definition are engaged in protecting their vested interests, and are by no means the real guardians of the American tradition. Since democracy by this definition implies participation in the solution of social problems by all members of the group concerned, it follows that children in school must also participate in the solution of social problems in order to learn how. Presumably this refers to the social problems they encounter in their life in school. Their participation is guarded by the proviso that they must not solve the problem in any way that would limit the participation of the entire group in the solution of subsequent problems. This seems to imply that if they elect a council to solve some of their social problems for them, they are violating fundamental democratic principles.

Social change is desired by all, but those who advocate the reconstruction of society are said to want only changes that would widen the area of participation in the solution of social problems. Evidently, then, those who advocate adjustment want reconstruction worse than the reconstructionists; they advocate all sorts of social changes that have nothing to do with increased participation, such as the application in practice of such generally accepted ideals as honesty, justice, temperance, and love of peace.

It is then demonstrated that an ideal does not need legal enactment or majority approval through legally constituted procedures in order to be called an "approved ideal." Each man must decide for himself what are the fundamental ideals of a democratic society. Should he then proceed to reconstruct them? Evidently not, in the opinion of the writer. The ideals have already been "reconstructed" in the process of deciding what they are. How disappointing it is to learn that the writer means by reconstruction only the right to interpret for oneself whatever ideals happen to be prevalent in the society in which one was born. What is ordinarily meant by reconstruction is a disposition to change or reject these ideals, having clearly understood what they are.

The writer will not countenance the right of teachers to "inculcate any ideals in which they individually believe." Teachers must have faith in democracy as defined above. What happens to teachers who believe in democracy and who attempt to inculcate other ideals in which they individually believe is not made clear.

The "uncritical acceptance" of democratic ideals is not enough to make them effective in the life of youth. These ideals must be lived: i. e., habitually practiced in school. One can think of no more effective way to adjust youth to the ideals prevailing in society than to have them practice these ideals habitually in every department of school life.

In summary the author declares that the school should be protected by society from pressure groups in its function of criticizing, evaluating, and reconstructing the objectives and procedures of society. This is to lead to the development of an indigenous social theory, depending on the adherence of teachers to the author's definition of democracy. The school is to implement this conception of democracy in terms not only of school practices but in terms of principles of economic and political organization such as are expressed in the report of the Committee on the Social-Economic Goals of America.

It may be cruel and arbitrary thus to paraphrase the literal meaning of an argument in which so much more is implied than is written. The central thesis seems to be that even a really effective "adjustment" to the central controlling principle of our society, the ideal of democracy, in itself implies liberal provisions for "reconstruction," inasmuch as democracy gives to every member of a social group the right to participate in the reconstruction of its objectives and procedures. Thus strict adherence to the principle of "adjustment" is impossible even in the most central of the prevailing social ideals. Since the argument is limited, however, to a discussion of the propagation of democracy, it is uncertain whether the argument would hold in the case of other social ideals than democracy. It seems entirely possible to "adjust" to such an ideal as honesty without "reconstructing" anything but one's private interpretation of honesty. This is not the sense in which the critics of present social arrangements wish the schools to "reconstruct" society.

Conclusions. The foregoing criticism of the argument for each alternative of the issue under discussion may illustrate the difficulties of the Committee in dealing with this issue. The logical problem involved was so perplexed and difficult that it seemed impossible for a group of school administrators to get down on paper a statement of either alternative that would hold water. Out of the discussion of the two opposed points of view, however, a few generalizations emerged on which the Committee seemed generally agreed:

1. Secondary education should dispose pupils favorably to social change. In this sense at least it should seek the reconstruction of society.

2. Secondary education should not plan the reconstruction of society in any sense that would commit the young to specific changes in the social order. It may legitimately attempt to foresee the probable course of events and to prepare youth to deal with it intelligently.

3. Teachers should play an active part in securing the acceptance by their communities of new social ideas and ideals. A practical procedure for this purpose will be described in the concluding section of this issue. In the exercise of this function their tenure of office should be protected by professional solidarity.

4. Whenever possible, social ideals should be examined in the questioning, critical spirit characteristic of scientific

inquiry. Necessary compromises with local prejudice should be frankly recognized as such, not justified in the name of social integration or democracy. Fear of opposition should not be rationalized as the immaturity of the learner. At one time or another the graduate of a public school should have sincerely questioned the wisdom of each of his fundamental beliefs, including his belief in democracy. Where direct questioning is prohibited, there should be provision for transfer. This should not lead to an indefinite suspension of belief. Questioning should be followed by investigation and by tentative acceptance or rejection.

5. When such a critical examination of a prevailing social ideal leads pupils and their teacher to accept it, it should be given such application in the pupils' lives as will lead them to practice it intelligently and with conviction wherever it is appropriate. In this sense the school should adjust pupils to prevailing social ideals.

6. When such a critical examination of a prevailing social ideal leads pupils and their teacher to reject it, they should not be required to profess belief in it. If the local situation is such that the ideal may not be attacked, it may be passed over in silence. A teacher should resign, however, rather than attempt to inculcate a social ideal against his conscience.

7. When such a critical examination of social ideas and ideals at variance with those of the local community leads pupils and their teacher to accept them, they should not be arbitrarily suppressed. Even granting that they were wrong, such treatment would convince them that they were right. In a world so full of wrong ideas a few more is a small price to pay for the precious heritage of freedom. In such cases, however, the group may be taught the necessity for discretion, tolerance, courtesy, and balance in getting along with one's neighbors.

8. An exception to the liberty of students to adopt whatever ideals their intelligence approves under guidance of a teacher may perhaps be made in behalf of a very few ideals which may be found absolutely necessary to social integration. Students are not at liberty to make an infernal nuisance of themselves even though they honestly believe this is desirable. No group of pupils or teachers would be likely to reject the ideals necessary for integration, but aberrant individuals might be checked. It should be kept in mind, how-

ever, that no one at present knows precisely what ideals these are.

9. The community should not overestimate the harm a wrong-headed teacher here and there can do even to individual pupils, much less to the social group. Even if the whole teaching profession were united in support of an ideal contrary to that prevailing in society, it is doubtful whether they could win support for this ideal from one fourth of their pupils in the face of all other influences playing upon pupils. A single teacher is infinitely less likely to succeed in seriously alienating even a single pupil from all the other forces that influence him. Even if he succeeded, a single wrong idea is not a serious handicap even to an individual, much less to the welfare of society as a whole. Such well-considered individual aberrations from what is currently considered wise and good should be welcomed as leaven in the social lump. The wrathful visitations of parents upon the school should usually be treated as cases of offended prejudice should be treated: tactfully and considerately but without taking them seriously.

10. The teaching profession should not insist fanatically upon the formula of critical examination of all social ideals under all circumstances. Many if not most of the prevailing social ideals, such as honesty, courtesy, tolerance, and balance may be tentatively accepted and practiced in school until situations arise which call for a more critical examination and definition of these virtues. Children should not have to deal with too many intellectual problems and emotional adjustments at once. If the whole problem of values is thrown open at once or kept open for too long a time, children may become so critical of assumptions that thinking is blocked. For this reason the critical consideration of many social issues may be postponed until, in the teacher's judgment, the time is ripe.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

Difficulties to Be Faced. The Committee recognized that the foregoing conclusions will not settle the issue. It must be resolved through techniques of social action that will enable secondary education to come to terms with the demands of the community. It is unquestionably true that society will not permit the unsettlement of such ideals as honesty, justice, tolerance and balance. In these demands secondary education will gladly concur and cooperate. It is unfortunately also true that many communities will not permit the unsettle-

ment of such mores and habits of mind as racial inequality, nationalism, militarism, and unrestricted private control of the means of production. These demands will be justified on the same basis as the former demands: the right of the majority to have its way. In practice it has this right: offending teachers may be removed. How may secondary education successfully resist these demands? How may it protect the necessary freedom of teachers in dealing honestly and realistically with social issues? A mere set of pious resolutions approved by the Committee would not stay the fury of the local patriots. Their effect would be that of a red flag to a bull. The Committee must offer teachers some more effective means of coming to terms with the demands of the community.

The crucial weakness of the present situation is that no one knows what social ideals are really approved by the higher conscience of the time, and any citizen may claim a majority for his point of view. The school can present no effective refutation of his claim. The Committee therefore proposes that the task of discovering and defining the social ideals which, when their implications are fully realized, command the adherence of the American people be given over to a continuing commission of the best and most representative minds of the nation—of statesmen, sociologists, social workers, economists, philosophers, educators, and publicists. Their tentative interpretation of the ideals which the majority of our citizens endorse and live by should be widely publicized in all units of society. The more discussion by groups of adult citizens, the better, for consideration will lead to general interest, the clarification of points of view, some amendment, and a greater degree of desirable integration than this nation has known. Fascism and Communism have been able to define clearly and convincingly their major social ideals and to secure their acceptance by the public at large. There is no reason why democracy can not do it as well. In a democracy this would not involve official propaganda for ideals enunciated by a controlling group. This is not the way of democracy; it calls for participation by all citizens in formulating the major common purposes of their society. The task of the commission would be only to discover and define these purposes or ideals, not to impose a point of view. Its success should be tested by questionnaires, reports from representative discussion meetings, written criticism, and any other means of validation which ingenuity can suggest.

Such a document, continuously modified in the light of new insight and changing conditions, may well become a Magna Charta for teachers. They will know in what directions society wishes to go, as defined not by the local busybody but by an intelligent and far-reaching appraisal of social trends. Then curriculum making will have directive goals that will permit desirable integration of youth with the major common purposes of his society and at the same time permit intelligent participation in the reformulation of these purposes in the light of changed conditions.

With this document in hand teachers could go before the local school board or parent-teachers association, explain that here was a list of social ideals defined by a representative commission and approved by a majority of their fellow citizens, point out their implications in the local situation, and challenge discussion. The brotherhood of man, for example, might be discussed in the light of compulsory military drill, racial inequality, the use of torture by police to extort confessions, the exploitation of labor, the manufacture of noxious foods and drugs for private profit, the activities of munitions makers, and the housing of the poor. If the ideal were approved, it should permit an honest and realistic study of these factors in our civilization on the part of secondary-school pupils. Any citizen who objected would have the awkward task of explaining why he chose to secede from the basic ideals approved by the majority of his peers. He would not be able, as at present, to pretend that the majority was on his side.

In recommending this procedure the Committee recognizes that it is gambling on the probability that secondary education will have no serious quarrel with social ideals formulated under such auspices. The small chance that the charter would interfere with the freedom necessary for effective teaching in the case of a few social issues would be worth taking in view of the protection such a document would afford from the unsupported prejudices of local busybodies.

The proposal of this charter may be somewhat inconsistent with the position taken earlier in this discussion that social ideals of every sort are not properly the concern of majority decisions; they change and grow as each learner grapples with his world. The charter, however, would provide an effective answer in their own terms to those who argue that social change of whatever sort should have the specific approval of the majority of citizens, and it would give

to all citizens, pupils and teachers alike a more comprehensive view of emotional and intellectual factors to be taken into account in dealing with the life of our time.

Such a proposal is no utopian dream. The recent report of the Committee on the Social-Economic Goals for America is an admirable beginning of this sort of interpretation of what democracy wants and in some measure is attempting to achieve. So is the fourth part of Beard's "A Charter for the Social Sciences." Other documents of this sort are undoubtedly in prospect. If the proposed compendium of American social ideals received general approval, the commission could be established and funds for its research could be secured almost immediately.

ISSUE X

Granting that education is a "gradual, continuous, unitary process," shall secondary education be presented merely as a phase of such a process, or shall it be organized as a distinct but closely articulating part of the entire educational program with peculiarly emphasized functions of its own?

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

If education is properly a "gradual, continuous, and unitary process," then it is up to educators to provide for boys and girls school experiences which promote an education of that kind.

The present administrative separation of school units conspires, however, to break the educational program into a series of disconnected experiences which the pupil has difficulty in assimilating and converting into personal growth. The inarticulation in the school program is especially acute wherever the administrative organization of the schools reflects the separate historical antecedents of elementary and secondary schools, or wherever it is arbitrarily determined by legal requirements, by conservative tradition, or by conformity to other institutions. In most places, efforts to solve the problem of inarticulation by administrative reorganizations have met with some success, but they have been limited by the difficulty of bringing young children long distances to large school units, by indifference or even hostility from the public, and by the necessity of spreading the cost of expensive facilities over large enrollments. The junior high school, the 6-4-4 plan, the six-year high school, and other similar plans represent the most that administrative reorganizations can do. Nowhere has there been achieved a complete or satisfactory fusion of a pupil's total educational experience in a single administrative unit, nor is it likely that there shall be.

It therefore appears that educators have been brought to an impasse. On the one hand, administrative necessity and the changing needs of children as they grow in age dictate the division of the school system into separate units. On the other hand, a fusion of school units in contrast to separation

is desirable if the continuity of the educational process is to be preserved.

Were educators to become convinced that a continuous educational process could go on only by retaining the pupil in a single school unit and allowing no breaks in the continuity of his experience, the prospect would be a very discouraging one. Fortunately, promotion through several administrative units does not make a continuous education impossible. In fact, there are advantages in separation if it takes into account the changes in a pupil's personality that develop over a long period of time. After educators have done what they can by administrative expedients to make the secondary schools serve the continuity of the educational process, they must then complete, by other means, an articulation between the secondary-school program and the programs which other units in the system offer.

Educators can best do this by first viewing, in the light of the aims and ideals expressed in the best of American life and thought, the whole program of public education as it may be made to contribute to the best development of the individuals in it and to the welfare of society as a whole. If they follow this by next determining the special functions of each unit in the educational scheme, specifying what each is expected to contribute to the directed growth of its pupils, they will go far toward removing the fundamental cause of inarticulation.

Improved educational techniques must also support efforts at closer articulation. A guidance program at all times concerned with the whole individual, broader training and wider experiences on the part of teachers, enlightened and unified control of each school system, and vertical supervision of instruction and curriculum development are all essential in creating, in spite of separate administrative units with separate functions, a closely articulated program of experiences appropriate to the education of each individual in the schools.

I. THE NATURE OF THE ISSUE

Education a Continuous Process. The position stated in the first clause of the Issue, namely, "that education is properly a 'gradual, continuous, unitary process,'" is the only one that is tenable either logically or psychologically. Education in its broadest sense, including experiences within the school as well as experiences outside of the school, does actually con-

stitute "a gradual, continuous, unitary process," the continuity of which inheres in the continuity of life and experience and the unity of which inheres in the unity of the mind and of personality. Obviously the only question that calls for discussion or debate is the practical relationship of those school experiences which are called secondary education to the continuous growth of the individual. In this connection it should be pointed out that education begins before a child's formal entrance into the school environment; it continues during the school period by means of many influences in addition to those that exist in the school; to a greater or less degree it is carried forward by all individuals after the close of the period of formal schooling. Very powerful are some of those extra-school influences that contribute to life-long education, not always of the most desirable sort. The movies are perhaps as potent as schools. The radio, the home, the church, books, magazines, and newspapers will suggest the range of these influences.

Present Separate Schools Tend Toward Discontinuity.

In view of the considerations of the preceding paragraph one naturally questions the reason for the existence of secondary schools entirely separated from other units of the educational system. We have four-year high schools administratively separated from the elementary schools below and the colleges above. This separation in some cases is even definitely established by law. In such cases everything conspires to make the formal educational process in the schools a series of disconnected experiences. If there is interrelationship or mayhap some degree of continuity between these experiences it is achieved only by dint of vigorous administrative and supervisory measures designed to counteract the evil effects of these separations. We look further and see junior high schools brought into the picture. One of the avowed purposes of the creation and development of this unit was to "bridge the gap" between the elementary school and the high school. They have unquestionably made some contribution in this direction. But the gap is as yet far from bridged. Those who have feared that the junior high school bridges one gap only to create two gaps advocate strongly the development of six-year high schools because these may contribute to the continuity of the educational process. Advocates of the 6-4-4 plan likewise urge the merits of their scheme upon the basis of greater con-

tinuity of experience for children.¹ All of the statements above are intended to point out the urgent need felt by educators of bringing administrative practice into line with the basic principle that education is "a gradual, continuous, unitary process," and that the schools should approximate as far as possible the continuity and unity implied in this basic principle.

Each community must at some time face the question of organization or reorganization of its school system on the basis of some pattern suggested above, or possibly upon the basis of some combination of these. Undoubtedly prevailing custom in a given large area or legal requirements within a state will be one strong determining factor. Children from one school system will find it necessary to transfer to another. The mobility of our school population is a well-recognized phenomenon. Furthermore, higher institutions must be organized upon the basis of the commonly prevailing organization of the lower schools. Graduates of secondary schools that are quite atypical will not find an easy adjustment to colleges organized to articulate with secondary schools of the prevailing mode.

The administrator who would organize his system on a basis quite different from that of all his neighbors faces the difficult problem of selling his scheme to his public. In a state organized on the 7-4 plan any attempt to set up in one locality a 6-3-3 plan would probably result disastrously. No better example of the perils of non-conformance can be cited than the difficulties that have beset the innovators who have started junior high schools in various places from 1910 to the present time. Such considerations as these must not be accepted as final deterrents to all innovation in the form of organization but they will serve as a warning that a public must be helped to understand the reasons and purposes back of such proposals and that changes cannot be foisted upon the community until there is a fair degree of readiness for them.

But factors other than prevailing practices will enter into the situation. Shall one set up a 6-6 plan or a 6-3-3 plan? The former has been widely advocated for small communities and rural areas where the small numbers in the secondary schools could not justify separate schools for both junior and senior high school to say nothing of the junior college. Under

¹Wm. M. Proctor: "The 6-4-4 Plan of School Organization in Pasadena, California." *Report to the Board of Education, the Patrons, and the Staff.* Board of Education, Pasadena, California, 1933.

such conditions separate junior high schools serving local areas could be justified only if all the several junior high schools combine to support one senior high school. Further combination of the senior high-school districts into a single junior-college district serving a large area such as a whole county may be indicated in a case of this sort.

The 6-4-4 plan has been advocated and actually installed in fairly large compact communities where one institution embracing grades 11, 12, 13 and 14 is reasonably accessible to the whole area to be served. Advantages claimed include greater continuity in the educational activities of children, fewer inducements to discontinue education at the end of grade 12, fewer problems of articulation, and much wider and greater utilization of the resources of the whole institution.

In closing this phase of the discussion it is only necessary to say that no hard and fast rule can be laid down for settling the question of system organization. Each situation must be studied in all its bearings. Decisions once reached must be modified as new factors enter the situation.

Causes of Separate Schools. The causes creating the situation that has brought about the isolation of the high school are too well known to need more than passing attention. They are largely historical and have been treated adequately by many scholars.

"It is clear that Calvinistic ideas backed by Calvinistic examples were at work. While the early schools were like the grammar schools of England, the relation of such schools to the public that they served, in the Calvinistic colonies of New England, was something very different. Here we have the interworking of the protest with the imitation. For in Calvinism was a Protestantism endlessly protesting. This attitude not only committed those who maintained it to unremitting efforts toward improvement on the civil and religious conditions of Old England; but in particular it made education necessary for its own continuance—and more and more education. The American colonists brought other protests in plenty with them from over seas, but none that had in it larger educational implications than this standing protest of Calvinism."² It is well known that the elementary school came out of a movement for popular education that all might have the necessary elementary skills. As each individual state has developed its own school system the elementary school has

²E. E. Brown: *The Making of Our Middle Schools*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1903.

generally preceded every other type of school and the secondary school has found a separate and unsatisfactorily articulated place in the system.

It is well known that the Latin grammar school of New England did not originate to fill a felt gap between the common school and the university. At the time there was apparently no thought that boys who had finished the common school would then enter the grammar school and so proceed to the university. Instead of filling a definite position in an articulated educational system it was a preparatory school dangling from the university.

It has often been felt that the secondary school was an intruder coming into the school system to take away the financial life-blood of the elementary school, the school of the common people. The high school has frequently been given separate sources of funds and a separate legal organization. Under such circumstances it has been inevitable that for a long time the high school would go its own educational way too often quite indifferent to or even scornful of the elementary school. Many years had to pass before the secondary school came to be considered a unit in a public school system more or less continuous in nature. It is not surprising, too, that the disarticulations coming out of such a historical development as the secondary school had should persist even to our own time. It is easily understandable that public school administrators feel that the "articulation of the units of American education"³ is one of the most difficult and most urgent problems of to-day's educational scheme.

In the matter of preparation of teachers it is to be noted that in general the elementary schools and the secondary schools draw their teachers from quite different sources, each having distinctly different points of view. In general, elementary teachers are given a so-called normal school training, whether in high school, normal school, or teachers' college. In general, the teachers in secondary schools are trained in colleges and universities. The collegiate point of view is naturally strong in their thinking. Emphasis upon separate subjects and the value of the mastery of subject matter, a necessary outcome of the type of training which they have had, tends to separate the secondary school in its curriculum and teaching approach from the elementary school.

³See the *Seventh and Ninth Yearbooks of the Department of Superintendence*, National Education Association, 1929 and 1931; also P. R. Brammell: *Articulation of High School and College*, Monograph No. 10, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1932, No. 17.

From the foregoing discussion it might be inferred that the modern emphasis upon the need for a well-articulated program of public education must bring us to only one conclusion, namely, that each child must have the opportunity to proceed through his entire public school course in a single institution embracing educational activities from the kindergarten at least through high school. Such a conclusion would be justified if we feel that the development of the individual can be interpreted only as the continuous accretion of understandings, insights, skills, habits, and attitudes, without breaks of any sort in that continuity.

It must be recognized, however, that mere continuous residence within a single institution over a period of years is no guarantee of a continuous and unitary educational program and that promotion through several administrative units does not make it impossible. Education must recognize the dynamic nature of the world and of behavior. Life is a progressive adjustment and the individual must continually redefine his purposes and correct and improve his procedures as life goes forward. Progress of the individual and of society comes about only by continual, gradual reinterpretation and redefinition of all social laws and standards in the light of enlarged experience and understanding. It is axiomatic that such growth takes place gradually. But we are not necessarily driven to the conclusion that the only or even the best type of institution to secure this redirection and reinterpretation of experience is one which recognizes only the gradualness of the change and is in no position to take adequate account of the great total amount of that change which comes over a considerable period of years in the growth of any child.

Difficulties Can Be Overcome. The difficulties of present and past experiences are largely responsible for making us feel that an education conforming to the point of view expressed in the last paragraph takes place with difficulty in separate institutions. Part of these present difficulties, as has been pointed out, are of historical origin and stay with us through the natural inertia that exists in established practices. There is no sufficient reason to feel that those difficulties cannot be overcome by a clear recognition of their presence and by the application to them of good principles of school administration and supervision.

The practical difficulties in the way of a single school ministering to the needs of children of all ages, from six up-

ward, need only be mentioned to be admitted. Variety and wide range in curricular offerings and activities are necessary or at least highly desirable at the upper and secondary level. These imply a well-trained group of teachers with considerable diversity of interests and abilities. There must be included, too, a considerable array of equipment and facilities in the way of rooms adapted to special activities. Such human and material resources involve a cost that is inordinate unless they are made available to a rather large group of pupils. If we are to expect to find such a good-sized group above the ninth grade in a school caring for all pupils from the ages of six to the age of eighteen, our school will have to be very large in the earlier grades. As a matter of fact, parents are so unwilling to send very young children any considerable distance from home that, even in most cities, there is constant pressure to keep schools small at the elementary level. Increasing traffic hazards and other complexities and dangers of modern life constitute no small factor in this situation. And so it comes about that, even though a fairly high percentage of pupils might stay in a given school from the sixth to the eighteenth year, the total number in any given upper grade is likely to be too small to have the advantages that might be brought to a larger group.

In this whole consideration we must not overlook the factor of population mobility, a very real phenomenon in many localities. In spite of schools designed to pass children forward steadily and uninterruptedly for a period of a dozen years, families do move about a great deal, and much of the fancied value would be lost if education were provided in a single administrative unit.

Practical problems involved in having within the same institution children of all ages are well known and obvious. A certain homogeneity arising from a small age range in the group is highly desirable, particularly in the direction of the development of a program of significance for social growth. Worth-while citizenship activities can hardly involve children who have no community of interest such as will exist where age differences are not too great. Very young children in an organization have slight chance to engage in activities that are significant to themselves where there are present many children considerably older. The older children will inevitably become the dominant group. They will have no interest in or use for the younger children in their social activities, and the latter will inevitably be pushed out of activities of all sorts.

Advantages of Separate Schools. One obvious advantage of segregated schools that minister particularly to the adolescent is that this segregation makes possible emphases that are peculiarly fitting to the adolescent stage of growth. Such emphases are much more easily made in a group in which the age-range is not too great. It must be recognized, of course, that practically some pre-adolescents will always be found in this "secondary group," and that, in general, the age-range is likely to be much greater than is originally recognized and provided for in the program of activities planned for the group in general and in the teaching methods employed. Since, too, individual interests begin to become strong at this level, interests which may be as wide as the range of life itself, it is often entirely impractical to create a situation sufficiently flexible to contribute adequately to the development of every individual. This is particularly true in the small high schools, of which this country has so great a number.

When we examine the considerations which might justify segregated elementary and secondary groups, we find it desirable that children acquire as early as possible certain abilities as a basis for their social adjustment to groups in which the exercise of these abilities is necessary or convenient. The segregated elementary school will be able to devote a portion of its energy to the imparting of these so-called tool skills. The need for these skills begins to arise quite early and many of them are then gradually achieved, but it can not be considered that the secondary school has no responsibility for continuing and adding to these skills. Undoubtedly additional training in such lines as reading, spelling, and quantitative understandings can and must become a part of the business of the early secondary years.

On the administrative side it should be remembered that ordinarily greater efficiency is likely to be developed when the range of administrative problems is narrowed. The preparation and experience of most school administrators are almost certain to be somewhat specialized. Only in unusual hands would the whole range of work in a unified school be developed with general and equal uniformity and skill.

Changing Factors. These social, economic, and administrative considerations are, of course, of a changing nature. At times of great economic stress and unemployment children tend to stay in school longer, particularly if satisfactory high school and college facilities are at hand. The junior college

located within a few miles of a pupil's home and charging no tuition will be eagerly filled with students seeking better equipment for life. Pupils in the high schools and junior colleges and adults in special classes alike seek answers to their questions about things as they find them to-day. They seek books and teachers to help them understand why things are as they are and what can be done about them. The age for entering business and industry is, for the present at least, considerably deferred, and the secondary schools can possibly give less attention to the immediate emphasis upon vocational preparation and possibly more to understanding of social phenomena, local, national, and world-wide.

The junior high school cannot fail to carry forward the program of socialized education so well started in elementary schools in many places. To this it must add opportunities for exploration and guidance which will go forward into the high school.

As conditions change from time to time they will produce changes in the organization of schools for the secondary period. Within the memory of most of us, the old 8-4 plan has been modified in an almost bewildering manner. We now find five-year elementary schools, six-year elementary schools, junior high schools with two, three, or even four years, combination junior-senior high schools of six years, junior colleges of two years, and, in some cases, of four years. Or, almost overnight, a great city will eliminate junior high schools and junior colleges and revert to an 8-4 plan on the grounds of economy. These modifications, the results of experiment induced by dissatisfaction with the existing order or of other less defensible causes, will undoubtedly produce profound changes in the internal organization of secondary schools. But the great hope is that the increasing tide of changes in forms of organization will inevitably produce effects in the curriculum practices and in teaching in secondary schools. In fact, changes in organization can hardly be considered significant unless these changes reach further than mere organization.

Continuity Not Fortuitous. If we are to defend the position that secondary education is to be a part of a gradual, continuous, unitary process, we must recognize the fact that the continuity is not going to be secured merely by accident, chance, or hope. Particularly is it true, since we must apparently admit the necessity for secondary schools separated

from other schools below and above, that continuity will be secured only if the educational program is planned in a unified way by the educational forces, both administrators and teachers. Those at all levels must understand the whole educational program and must actively coöperate in its development. Articulation must rest on an understanding by every teacher and supervisor of the functions of schools of all levels.

But no amount of excellent machinery for supervision and administration can unaided produce the continuity of the educational process as suggested above. In addition there is needed some person who keeps in his thought the child as an individual who is moving through these experiences that we call education. This implies a guidance program which, although it may be concerned with vocation at certain levels and with other things at other levels, will at *all* times be concerned with the *whole* individual. If the goal of education is the understanding and practice of the "good life," then the guidance program must attempt to aid each child to move forward continuously toward a more significant interpretation of social relationships and aesthetic values. It will be concerned that each individual child develop and maintain an open-minded attitude toward all of his experiences.

In spite of our advocacy of segregated secondary schools we must again come back to the statement in the issue that these shall be organized as "*closely* articulating parts of the entire educational program." Educational literature is replete with suggestions about preserving this close articulation. It must be pointed out, however, that the problem is broader than a question of administrative devices or machinery. If there is to be a continuous, unitary education for the youth of America, there must be likewise a general public recognition of unitary purposes and aims in our national thinking and living. As a matter of fact, our country to-day has no commonly recognized or reasonably universally accepted aims or goals. As a whole, the country and all its component units drift along with no star to guide them. It is small wonder that education, too, has drifted along in a distinctly opportunist fashion. Are the schools concerned as to whether we have such goals or not? Are they concerned as to who sets such goals? Have they no part in developing such goals? As a matter of fact, we who are in the schools must face squarely the question of whether national goals and ideals are to be set for us by a dictator or by groups of leaders from the whole country, and whether education is to attempt

to interpret these goals and ideals and make them alive in the thinking and living of the people.

If such a responsibility is put upon the schools, there must be a broader training and wider living on the part of teachers. Teachers as a whole must understand social ideals and the meaning of living in this country in a very vital way. This is particularly true in the secondary school, because the tendency of the teacher training program with its emphasis on professional courses and teaching majors and minors has been to drive the future teachers of the country into an ever narrowing path from the high school to the professional school. It would be desirable also that teachers in the secondary schools have some experience of teaching in the elementary schools so that they may the more easily and surely make the educational experiences of children continuous from the elementary years into the secondary years. It would be well if teachers could have experiences in earning a living outside the field of teaching so that they might better understand the way the world moves and lives and has its being. If such were the case, all teaching might be less academic and the teacher might better be able to help the child achieve a continuous accretion of understanding, insight, skills, habits, and attitudes that would be significant for his adjustment to the world which he must very soon enter.

In spite of the difficulties which develop when secondary education is set up as a separate unit, continuity of this unit with other educational units that are within the control of the public schools can be secured in large measure by enlightened, unified control. While this control is important on the side of administration it is tremendously more important on the side of supervision. Unified supervision, embracing the activities of the direction of instruction and of curriculum development, can do more to aid teachers to see the field of education as a single unit than any other force available at the present time in the field of education. This implies, of course, that the administrative unit is large enough to afford specialized help in this field and that those who direct the program of supervision and curriculum interpretation are well enough trained and broadly enough experienced so that they are really prepared to achieve this most important end. It is also presupposed that the district concerned has resources sufficient to finance such a program and vision clear enough to believe in the value of such work. In these days of retrenchment and curtailment the first point of attack too often

is supervision and curriculum work. These activities are classed as fads and frills by the average tax-payer. Of course, if the tax-payer forces upon us the necessity that the educational program is to be dictated very largely by text book makers and the undirected and unrestrained notions of the individual teacher or principal, discontinuity and disintegration are certain to characterize it.

Standing firmly in the position that education should be a gradual, continuous, and unitary process, and conceding the practical advantages of separate administrative units, we emphasize again the necessity of far better articulation than is now had to secure the desired end. To achieve this, the special functions of each unit should be determined, so that it may know what contributions are expected of it to the directed growth of each and every individual. At present there is no general agreement as to what the elementary school, what the secondary school, and what the college should attempt; and, as a result, there are vast overlappings in effort and conspicuous gaps in accomplishment. This lack is the most fundamental cause of disastrous inarticulations. An attempt to define the special functions of secondary education will constitute the next contribution of the Committee on Orientation.

II. CONCLUSIONS

1. The fundamenal factor in the consideration of this issue is the unity of the educational process.
2. Separate secondary schools are necessary to perform most effectively the functions of secondary education.
3. We must get rid of the idea of one school preparing for another and foster the idea of the schools continuously centering attention on the intellectual and emotional needs of the child. This is needed particularly in the high school where emphasis on subject-matter fields is prevalent.
4. Supervision should be vertical from the kindergarten through the junior college.
5. The superintendent must take the primary responsibility for the articulation of the secondary schools with all other units of the system.
6. The secondary principal must take the initiative in developing in himself and in his teachers an understanding,

appreciation, and intimate knowledge of the program, the problems, and the pupils of the elementary school.

7. Satisfactory articulation can be promoted by:

- (a) A common philosophy of education
- (b) An understanding of functions of the schools of all levels
- (c) The exchange of teachers between schools of different levels
- (d) A guidance program which definitely includes visits and conferences between teachers of schools of different levels
- (e) The establishment of a unified curriculum program

8. A unified plan of supervision is vitally necessary to achieve unity in the education of the child.

9. A single unified financial and legal control of the schools of all levels in one area will tend to promote the unity of the education of the child.

10. Transition of a pupil from a school of one level or type to another should be made a matter of joint conference between the teacher or counselor in the first school and the counselor or principal in the second.

11. Each teacher, supervisor and administrator in the secondary school should have a clear vision of the place of the secondary school in the whole educational scheme both above and below.

12. Each teacher, supervisor, and administrator should have a clear conception of the special functions of secondary education.

13. Diagnostic tests should be given at appropriate intervals to determine what children know and what they need to be taught.

14. It is probably desirable to transfer from the elementary school to the junior high school children who have reached such a level of physical or social maturity that they can better profit by the activities and environment of the junior high school than by remaining in the elementary school. This is true even though a given amount of subject-matter has not been completely mastered or a certain scholastic standing achieved. Likewise it is desirable to transfer children from junior high school to senior high school and from the

senior high school to the junior college or other advanced school when they probably will profit more from the activities possible in the new situation. In each of these cases it becomes the responsibility of the unit receiving the pupils to set up activities appropriate to their preparation and maturity.

15. Only those activities should find a place in the secondary school that clearly contribute to a realization of the special functions of secondary education.

16. Continuity between the educational units will be promoted by eliminating graduation from each unit accompanied by the award of the usual diploma. This ritual tends to set up false and undesirable ideas of education in the mind of the child and of his parents.

P R O G R A M

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

February 22, 24, 25, and 26, 1936

Headquarters of Department, Municipal Auditorium
All sessions of the Meeting of the Department of Secondary-School Principals will be held in the Municipal Auditorium.

Saturday, February 22

Joint Dinner, 6 P. M.-8 P. M.

Department and National Vocational Guidance Association.

Monday, 9:30 A. M., Municipal Auditorium

General Session—Department of Superintendence and Department of Secondary-School Principals.

The Ten Most Important Issues in Secondary Education,

Thomas H. Briggs, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

NOTE—This is the formal presentation of the report of the Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education of the Department of Secondary-School Principals.

Monday, 2:00 P. M., Municipal Auditorium,

Assembly Hall No. 3

General Session—Department of Secondary-School Principals.

Presiding: Harrison C. Lyseth, State Director of Secondary Education, Augusta, Maine, and President Department of Secondary-School Principals.

THEME—PART I—The Activities of the Department.

1. *The Story of the Department* (15 minutes)

C. O. Davis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

2. *The National Honor Society, An Essential* (25 minutes)

M. R. McDaniel, Principal Oak Park and River Forest Township High School, Oak Park, Illinois, and President National Honor Society.

3. *Some Services of the Department* (10 minutes)

H. V. Church, Executive Secretary Department of Secondary-School Principals, Chicago, Illinois.

THEME—PART II—The Department Looks Ahead.

1. *Study Groups and the Experimental Center* (30 minutes)
John H. Tyson, Principal Upper Darby Senior High School, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania.
2. *Education for Safety in America's Secondary Schools* (30 minutes)
Sidney J. Williams, Director Public Safety Division, National Safety Council, Chicago, Illinois.
3. *Factors Associated with Non-Attendance of Pupils in Secondary Schools* (30 minutes)
James F. Bursch, Director of Research, Sacramento Public Schools, Sacramento, California. An exchange speaker with American Educational Research Association.
4. *The Need of Knowledge and Faith in the Secondary School* (15 minutes)
Charles F. Allen, Supervisor of Secondary Education, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Tuesday, 7:45 A. M., Hotel Jefferson.

Department Breakfast

SOCIAL PROGRAM

Tuesday, 9:30 A. M., Municipal Auditorium

Assembly Hall No. 3

General Session—Department of Secondary-School Principals.
Presiding—Willard N. Van Slyck, Principal Topeka High School, Topeka, Kansas, and First Vice-President Department of Secondary-School Principals.

Chairman—Thomas H. Briggs, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

THEME—Discussion of Report of the Committee on Orientation of Secondary Education.

9:40—ISSUE I.

Shall secondary education be provided at public expense for all normal individuals, or for only a limited number?

W. F. Dyde, Professor of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

Clyde M. Hill, Professor of Education, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

ISSUE II.

Shall secondary education seek to retain all pupils in school as long as they wish to remain, or shall it transfer them to other agencies under educational supervision when, in the judgment of the school authorities, these agencies promise to serve better the pupils' immediate and probable future needs?

Lloyd N. Morrisset, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Yonkers, New York.

McClellan G. Jones, Principal of Union High School, Huntington Beach, California.

10:20—SUMMARY OF ISSUES I AND II.

Francis T. Spaulding, Professor of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

10:30—ISSUE III.

Shall secondary education be concerned only with the welfare and progress of the individual, or with these only as they promise to contribute to the welfare and progress of society?

DeWitt Morgan, Principal Arsenal Technical High School, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Charles F. Towne, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Providence, Rhode Island.

10:50—SUMMARY OF ISSUE III.

Truman G. Reed, Principal Wichita High School East, Wichita, Kansas.

11:00—ISSUE IV.

Shall secondary education provide a common curriculum for all, or differentiated offerings?

Clifford Woody, Director Bureau of Educational Reference and Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

J. E. Stonecipher, Principal Roosevelt High School, Des Moines, Iowa.

11:20—SUMMARY OF ISSUE IV.

H. H. Ryan, Principal Wisconsin High School, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

11:30—ISSUE V.

Shall secondary education include vocational training, or shall it be restricted to general education?

Franklin J. Keller, Director National Occupational Conference, Fifth Avenue, New York.

Dwight Porter, Principal Omaha High School, Omaha, Nebraska.

11:50—SUMMARY OF ISSUE V.

Curtis H. Threlkeld, Principal Columbia High School, South Orange and Maplewood, New Jersey.

**Tuesday, 2:00 P. M., Municipal Auditorium,
Assembly Hall No. 3**

General Session—Department of Secondary-School Principals.

Presiding—McClellan G. Jones, Principal Union High School, Huntington Beach, California, and Second Vice-President Department of Secondary-School Principals.

Chairman—Thomas H. Briggs, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

2:00—ISSUE VI.

Shall secondary education be primarily directed toward preparation for advanced studies, or shall it be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses, regardless of a student's future academic career?

Samuel Everett, Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Paul E. Elicker, Principal Newton High School, Newtonville, Massachusetts.

2:20—SUMMARY OF ISSUE VI.

Francis L. Bacon, Principal Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois.

2:30—ISSUE VII.

Shall secondary education accept conventional-school subjects as fundamental categories under which school experiences shall be classified and presented to students, or shall it arrange and present experiences in fundamental categories directly related to the performance of such functions of secondary schools in a democracy as increasing the ability and the desire better to meet socio-civic, economic, health, leisure-time, vocational, and pre-professional problems and situations?

Lou LaBrant, Professor of English-Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Paul Hanna, Professor of Education, Stanford University, Stanford University, California.

2:50—SUMMARY OF ISSUE VII.

Will French, Superintendent of Schools, Long Beach, California.

3:00—ISSUE VIII.

Shall secondary education present merely organized knowledge, or shall it also assume responsibility for attitudes and ideals?

B. P. Fowler, Principal Tower High School, Wilmington, Delaware.

Guy Hill, Principal East Lansing High School, East Lansing, Michigan.

3:20—SUMMARY OF ISSUE VIII.

John A. Lester, Friends' Council on Education, Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

3:30—ISSUE IX.

Shall secondary education seek merely the adjustment of students to prevailing social ideals, or shall it seek the reconstruction of society?

W. M. Land, Principal Lyndhurst High School, Lyndhurst, New Jersey.

Carleton Washburne, Superintendent Winnetka Public Schools, Winnetka, Illinois.

3:50—SUMMARY OF ISSUE IX.

Rudolph D. Lindquist, Director of the University School, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

4:00—ISSUE X.

Granting that education is a "gradual, continuous, unitary process," shall secondary education be presented merely as a phase of such a process, or shall it be organized as a distinct but closely articulating part of the entire educational program with peculiarly emphasized functions of its own?

Howard V. Funk, Principal Bronxville Junior High School, Bronxville, New York.

Harl R. Douglass, Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

4:20—SUMMARY OF ISSUE X.

Arthur Gould, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles, California.

Wednesday, 9:30 A. M., Municipal Auditorium.

Sectional Meetings—Department of Secondary-School Principals.

I. *Research Section*, Municipal Auditorium, Assembly Hall No. 3.

Presiding—Charles H. Judd, Chairman Department of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Dr. Homer P. Rainey, Director of the Staff of the American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education.

Mr. Charles W. Taussig, Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the National Youth Administration.

Mr. Charles W. Eliot, 2nd., Executive Secretary of the National Resources Committee.

Mr. Thomas F. Neblett, President of the National Student Federation of the United States of America.

THEME—A Symposium on Youth Problems and Their Solutions. (Speakers to be presented from American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, the National Youth Administration, the National Resources Board, and other organized youth associations of the country.)

II. *The Junior High School*, Municipal Auditorium, Room to be announced.

Presiding: Kenley J. Clark, Principal Murphy High School, Mobile, Alabama.

THEME—Problems of the New Junior High School.

A Program of Testing for the Junior High School,

Ray G. Wood, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio.

Address,

W. L. Spencer, State Supervisor of Secondary Education, Montgomery, Alabama.

(Other speakers to be announced.)

III. *The Senior High School*, Municipal Auditorium, Assembly Hall No. 4.

Presiding: Charles F. Allen, Supervisor of Secondary Education, Little Rock, Arkansas.

THEME—America's Challenge to the Senior High School.

Vitalizing the Program of the Small High School,

Earl Platt, Professor of Education, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Educating for Life and Character,

Howard LeSourd, Dean of Graduate School, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

Educating for Vocational Competency,

Francis T. Spaulding, Professor of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Coöperative Study of School Standards,

George E. Carrothers, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

IV. *The Junior College*, Municipal Auditorium, Room to be announced.

Presiding: Milton D. Proctor, President Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine.

Assimilating Junior College Transfers in the University,

Gilbert Wrenn, Assistant Registrar, Stanford University, Stanford University, California.

The General College of the University of Minnesota,

Malcolm S. MacLean, Director General College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Wednesday, 12:00 Noon, Hotel Jefferson, Crystal Room.

Department Luncheon

BUSINESS MEETING

Luncheon Speaker, Ernest W. Butterfield, Commissioner of Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

Wednesday, 2:15 P. M., Municipal Auditorium.

Directed Group Discussions—Department of Superintendence and Department of Secondary-School Principals.

DIVISION III—The Junior High School (Meeting places to be announced).

Chairman—James N. Spinning, Superintendent of Schools, Rochester, New York.

DIVISION IV—The Senior High School (Meeting places to be announced).

Chairman—Harrison C. Lyseth, State Director of Secondary Education, Augusta, Maine, and President Department of Secondary-School Principals.

DIVISION VI—Post Graduate and Junior College (Meeting places to be announced).

Chairman—Francis L. Bacon, Superintendent Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois.

NOTE—*For complete details consult the final program.*

POSTAL INSURANCE

**This bulletin is insured by
THE NORTHWESTERN NATIONAL
INSURANCE COMPANY**

If the property contained in this package is damaged, or any part of the contents lost, please report the extent of loss or damage at once to the Department together with the original wrapper of the parcel.

This insurance covers all parcels shipped by the Department of Secondary-School Principals, whether mailed first class, registered, unregistered, or parcel post.

Send all reports of loss with the original wrapper of the package to

**THE DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY-
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**

5835 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago.

THEME—America's Challenge to the Senior High School.

Vitalizing the Program of the Small High School,

Earl Platt, Professor of Education, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Educating for Life and Character,

Howard LeSourd, Dean of Graduate School, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

Educating for Vocational Competency,

Francis T. Spaulding, Professor of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Coöperative Study of School Standards,

George E. Carrothers, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

IV. *The Junior College*, Municipal Auditorium, Room to be announced.

Presiding: Milton D. Proctor, President Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine.

Assimilating Junior College Transfers in the University,

Gilbert Wrenn, Assistant Registrar, Stanford University, Stanford University, California.

The General College of the University of Minnesota,

Malcolm S. MacLean, Director General College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Wednesday, 12:00 Noon, Hotel Jefferson, Crystal Room.

Department Luncheon

BUSINESS MEETING

Luncheon Speaker, Ernest W. Butterfield, Commissioner of Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

Wednesday, 2:15 P. M., Municipal Auditorium.

Directed Group Discussions—Department of Superintendence and Department of Secondary-School Principals.

DIVISION III—The Junior High School (Meeting places to be announced).

*Chairman—*James N. Spinning, Superintendent of Schools, Rochester, New York.

DIVISION IV—The Senior High School (Meeting places to be announced).

Chairman—Harrison C. Lyseth, State Director of Secondary Education, Augusta, Maine, and President Department of Secondary-School Principals.

DIVISION VI—Post Graduate and Junior College (Meeting places to be announced).

Chairman—Francis L. Bacon, Superintendent Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois.

NOTE—*For complete details consult the final program.*

POSTAL INSURANCE

This bulletin is insured by
**THE NORTHWESTERN NATIONAL
INSURANCE COMPANY**

If the property contained in this package is damaged, or any part of the contents lost, please report the extent of loss or damage at once to the Department together with the original wrapper of the parcel.

This insurance covers all parcels shipped by the Department of Secondary-School Principals, whether mailed first class, registered, unregistered, or parcel post.

Send all reports of loss with the original wrapper of the package to

**THE DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY-
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**
5835 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago.

